

bill, permitting cooperative buying and selling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3080. Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, of Chicago, favoring the repeal of the excess-profits tax law and the substitution of a flat tax on sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3081. Also, petition of operating and marine engineer service, protesting against report of the Joint Committee on Reclassification of Salaries; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3082. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Botts-Fiorito Post, No. 576, the American Legion, of Le Roy, N. Y., urging the passage of legislation providing for the payment in cash of additional compensation to ex-service men based on the number of days' service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3083. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of residents of Coopers-town and Bowman and vicinity, N. Dak., protesting against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3084. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Williston, N. Dak., protesting against the deportation of citizens without proper process of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3085. Also, petition of the Association of American State Geologists, approving of plan for a survey of the power requirements of the Washington-Boston industrial area; to the Committee on Water Power.

3086. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the New Haven Real Estate Board of New Haven, Conn., opposing House bill No. 12397; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 20, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bring to Thee the high motives of this place and office with a resolve to do our best to uplift the world and to glorify Thy name. We open our hearts to the impression of Thy truth as we start upon the duties of a new day, and pray Thee to guide us in all our deliberations. May our conclusions have Thy favor resting upon them. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1920.

To the SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

M. SMOOT thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer for the day.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 806. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States; and

S. 2442. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the trustees of the Yankton Agency Presbyterian Church, by patent in fee, certain land within the Yankton Indian Reservation.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 5163. An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8690. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen;

H. R. 9228. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.;

H. R. 10917. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States" by adding thereto an additional section;

H. R. 12956. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 13229. An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau;

H. R. 13253. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River;

H. R. 13274. An act to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 13387. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin;

H. R. 13592. An act to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries; and

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 12260) to amend section 600 of the act approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," and it was thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 9228. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.;

H. R. 12956. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 13253. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River; and

H. R. 13387. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 8690. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen; and

H. R. 13592. An act to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries.

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 13274. An act to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas; and

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

H. R. 5163. An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 13229. An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

H. R. 10917. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States by adding thereto an additional section" was read twice by its title.

Mr. KING. I did not hear the suggestion which the Secretary made to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has asked that the bill go to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KING. I think it should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. All such measures which provide for Federal charters go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that matter is receiving consideration there now. I ask that no reference be made of the bill until the Senator from Iowa is here, as I would not want to make any motion in his absence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by Boston Lodge No. 264, International Association of Machinists, of Boston, Mass., favoring the release of certain Federal prisoners; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Hamilton S. Hawkins, Camp No. 43, Department of California, United Spanish War Veterans, of Soldiers Home, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; which was ordered to lie on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, reported it with an amendment.

ST. LOUIS RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment, from the Committee on Commerce, the bill (H. R. 13387) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and I submit a report (No. 529) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by act of Congress approved August 7, 1916, to be built across the St. Louis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, from the village of Fond du Lac, a suburb of Duluth, Minn., to a point on the Wisconsin shore about 100 feet westerly from the mouth of Dubray Creek, is hereby extended one year from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4255) establishing the liability of hotel proprietors and innkeepers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4256) to amend sections 3 and 6 of the act of July 11, 1916, entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," as amended by sections 5 and 6 of the act of February 28, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4257) granting a pension to Leonora Forney; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MYERS (for Mr. WALSH of Montana) submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell at public auction lots 1, 2, and 3, block 120, with any improvements, of the original town site of Billings, Mont., used as a United States mine rescue station, etc., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PANAMA CANAL ACT.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," known as the Panama Canal provision, and I introduce the bill by request under circumstances which I ask leave to state to the Senate.

When the railroad bill was pending before the conferees the bill from the House contained a clause modifying the Panama Canal act and permitting the railroad companies to own steamships with which they compete on the Great Lakes and on the other inland waters, except the Mississippi River and the Panama Canal. I opposed this measure in conference, and it was rejected by the conferees, with an understanding, however, that I would introduce it by request as a separate bill, and that

the Committee on Interstate Commerce would give the communities mostly interested along the Great Lakes and the New England coast a hearing upon the bill. The New England Representatives were very anxious to clarify the railroad situation between New York and Boston and various intermediate towns where the New Haven road owns certain steamship lines.

Pursuant to that understanding, I introduce this bill. I did not favor it as a member of the conference committee, and I do not think I shall favor it now; but certainly the communities interested are entitled to a hearing, and there are Senators who desire to have the bill become a law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator? Probably the Senator is going to have the bill read, and in that case I can ascertain what I rose to ask, and that is the purpose of the measure.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will state the purpose of the bill. The Senator will recollect that the Panama Canal act prohibits any railroad company from owning and controlling ships through the Panama Canal or any of the inland waters or coastwise waters of the United States where the railroad competes with those steamship lines. This provision, which has been adopted by the House, is intended to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission, if it thought it was in the interest of the public and not unduly restrictive of competition, to permit railroad companies to own ships on the Great Lakes and the inland waters and the coastwise waters, although they were competitors. I thought that the Panama Canal act had been passed, after years of agitation and public discussion, as a policy, and that certainly it ought not to be amended by a mere provision adopted in a railroad bill of which the public seemed to have no knowledge whatever. So I agreed that I would introduce this bill and ask the Committee on Interstate Commerce to grant hearings to interested parties. Personally I have not changed my opinion at all.

The bill (S. 4254) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

CALLING THE ROLL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Smoot
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Calder	Kellogg	Nugent	Sterling
Chamberlain	King	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Kirby	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Knox	Phelan	Underwood
Dial	Lenroot	Phipps	Wadsworth
Gerry	Lodge	Pittman	Warren
Glass	McCormick	Reed	Wolcott
Harris	McCumber	Sheppard	
Harrison	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	
Henderson	McNary	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is detained at a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on official business.

I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] in attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. SWANSON answered to his name when called.

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. KEYES, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. TRAMMELL entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

M'CLINTIC-MARSHALL CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. KNOX. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1353) for the relief of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co. This is a bill that was reached on the calendar about two weeks ago. There is no objection to it, except that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] asked to have an opportunity to make some investigation as to an objection

that had been made to him by a constituent. I understand the Senator from Ohio does not desire to pursue that any further and has no objection to the consideration of the measure. Am I correct?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I did make objection to the consideration of the bill, and in a very general way I stated the ground of my objection. My objection was based upon some correspondence that I had with an Ohio manufacturing firm that I understood bid upon the same work in which the company named in the bill was concerned. I am frank to say that I have not been able to get my files in the matter, and I do not know the name of the firm; it escapes my memory. The Senator from Pennsylvania, however, assured me the other day that this claim was based upon other elements than those which I had in mind. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KNOX. That is correct.

Mr. POMERENE. That being so, I have no disposition to interpose my objection further. I do not feel that it would be quite just under the circumstances to the claimant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1353) for the relief of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co., which is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co. the sum of \$714,007.39, as recommended in the report made to Congress under date of February 11, 1916, by the commission appointed under the act of June 24, 1914, and approved by the Governor of the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 906, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), the said act being as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That George W. Goethals, Governor of the Canal Zone and formerly chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the claim of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, having its principal office in the city of Pittsburgh, in said State, and to ascertain what amount, if any, is in justice, equity, and fairness due and owing to said McClintic-Marshall Construction Co. from the Isthmian Canal Commission for work and labor done and material furnished in connection with the construction and erection of lock gates and appurtenances for the Panama Canal and in connection with and incidental to the doing of the work and furnishing of the materials provided for in a certain contract between the Isthmian Canal Commission and the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co., dated June 21, 1910, taking into consideration the claim of the contractors that the work was done under requirements as to character and finish not fairly within the meaning of the specifications.

The said Col. George W. Goethals, Governor of the Canal Zone, is further authorized and empowered, either personally or through such commissions as he may appoint, to investigate such claims and the various items thereof in such manner as to him may seem best, and, either personally or through such commission, is hereby empowered to administer oaths and affirmations to witnesses and to issue subpoenas and to compel the attendance of witnesses. He shall report in detail to the Congress of the United States his findings."

The amount herein appropriated shall be chargeable as part of the construction of the Panama Canal and reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act approved June 28, 1902, and section 39 of the tariff act approved August 5, 1909.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY REORGANIZATION.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3792) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the United States Army, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3792) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the United States Army, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

PAY OF NAVY AND COAST GUARD.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, for a long time past the attention of the public has been called to the unfortunate condition of the officers and men of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard, owing to the increased cost of living, but I do not believe that the true seriousness of the situation is realized, for not only is injury being done to the men and their families but all of these branches of the service are being crippled, and the Navy certainly placed in a position where it will take some years to put it in the condition that it was in before the war. I intend to confine my remarks to the Navy and Coast Guard, because, as a

member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I am familiar with their condition, and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has already explained on the floor of the Senate very fully the situation that exists in the Army.

The responsibility for this retrogression of our fighting forces rests upon Congress. It was called to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate by the Secretary of the Navy last August, and to that of the chairman of the House committee, I believe, in September. In November it was again called to the notice of the latter committee, and in December a letter was written to the Speaker of the House urging action. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] introduced an increased-pay bill for the Army and Navy in November, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and reported out from that committee in December. In January a bill for partial relief was introduced in the House by Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That bill granted an increase in pay to the enlisted men only. In February a bill increasing the pay of the officers and men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service was passed by the Senate, and a conference with the House was asked for. In the middle of March the House granted the conference. I am informed this morning that the conferees have again disagreed, and that therefore more delay must ensue. It is only fair to say that the responsibility in refusing to grant these increases does not rest with the Senate.

I desire to call attention to some statistics which, I believe, are convincing as to the actual situation, and shall refer principally to the testimony of Admiral Washington before a subcommittee of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee.

The most deplorable feature about this whole delay is that had this bill increasing the pay been passed last October, between 70,000 and 80,000 ex-service men would have returned to the Navy. It is not believed now that one-fourth of this number will go back, even if this measure is enacted into law. The older men who have returned to civil life and taken up work on shore are each week less likely to desire to renew their naval service. At the beginning of the winter, at Bay Ridge, N. Y., there were about 1,200 to 1,400 men whose terms of enlistment had expired or was about to expire. These men had been 8, 12, or 16 years in the Navy, and were thoroughly trained and efficient. They held over with the hope that Congress would pass an increased-pay bill, and when Congress adjourned in December without any action several hundred of them immediately asked for their discharge, and it had to be given to them. Others stayed on until early in January, and finally practically all of them left.

Fifty-five per cent of the present total strength of the Navy is made up of men who first enlisted since December 4, 1918, and it is estimated that 66 per cent of the first enlistments, from December 4, 1918, to January, 1920, were boys under 19 years of age.

The petty officers and chief petty officers are leaving the service in alarming numbers, and they are the leaven that is so vital to the training of the new recruits. There is nothing that could do more harm to the service than the loss of this part of the personnel. The men, however, can not be blamed for wanting to leave when a sailor, who gets \$32.60 a month in the Navy, can go with the American Transport Service or with the Shipping Board and immediately get \$75 per month; and, besides this, receive \$1.50 or \$2 additional for subsistence and other expenses. A seaman, second class, getting \$35 in the Navy, gets \$100 with the Shipping Board, and so on right up the line.

The Shipping Board and the American Transport Service pay men two to three and one-half times the amount the Navy pays. They are able to do this because their appropriations, I understand, are made in lump sums, which allow them to use discretion as to wages and meet conditions in any part of the world.

Under those circumstances, is it unnatural that requests for discharges are being received at the average of 28 per day? About 7 of such requests are approved each day, and with a few exceptions the older men are those making the applications for release, not only because of the advantages that they can obtain by seeking employment in civil life, but also because the present pay of the Navy is not sufficient for them to maintain their families with, and they feel, and I think quite properly, that the United States Government is doing injustice to those who have been its faithful public servants.

During the last six months of 1919 the desertions among the enlisted men have become appallingly large, and affected a class that has practically never been touched by this before, namely, the petty officers and chief petty officers. There were 4,666 desertions, which included 1,057 petty officers and senior rated men—seamen and firemen, first class—of whom 60 were

chief petty officers. In January last 898 men deserted, and in February 765. The number was less in February probably because the fleet was in southern waters, where it was more difficult for men to reach home should they leave their ships. Of the number who deserted in February, there were 60 rated petty officers and 7 chief petty officers. Admiral Washington stated that it was practically impossible to recover any considerable number of these deserters, owing to their going to sea, and so forth, and that they were therefore lost entirely to the service.

The Navy enlisted personnel allowed by law up to July 1, 1920, is 170,000. In the service on March 1, 1920, there were about one hundred and one thousand and some odd men—in other words, a shortage of about 68,000 men. Of this 101,000, roughly, 79,400 are first enlistments and 22,000 reenlistments. At the present time recruits have been withdrawn from the training stations after one month to six weeks' training, instead of three or four months, as is usual, therefore, of course, increasing the need of the desirability of a nucleus of trained seamen. Our battleship fleet to-day is manned by about 70 per cent of its normal crew.

If we take the condition on one of our great dreadnoughts, the situation shows up even more clearly. The *Pennsylvania* by August, 1920, will lose over 300 experienced men who remained from last year. One out of every six of the electricians will be gone, and out of the engineers' complement one out of three, and similar percentages in other departments.

Turning to the officers, the condition is just as bad. At the present time we are short of regulars in the line to the number of 2,638. Afloat on the different ships in the dreadnought class there are 954 officers, but there ought to be 1,500. On the pre-dreadnoughts, they have 444, where they also ought to have about 1,500. On the armored cruisers, they have 200, where they need 1,200. On the gunboats, they have 60, where they should have 150; on the destroyers, 875, instead of 1,800, and on the submarines, 269, instead of 400. The staff shrinkage is proportionate to that of the line. The officers are seeking to leave because they, too, are unable to support their families and keep out of debt. Many of them have been forced to make great personal sacrifices in order to remain in the service, and I am sure that nearly every Senator, from the seacoast States at least, has had facts called to his attention that make him indignant that splendid men should be placed in such an unfair position, and that their families should have to suffer because of their serving their country.

There are now pending 88 resignations of line officers. The Secretary is holding up all applications of those who have been less than eight years in the service. If resignations were easier to obtain, it is the feeling of the department that many more would be asked for. The Naval Academy will not fill up the line of the Navy for 10 years under the present circumstances, and during that period all our ships will be short of necessary line officers.

In the Coast Guard the situation is equally bad. Probably the clearest way to show the situation is to call attention to some statistics from a district with which I am familiar. The quota of this district is 146. The number of men discharged at their own request in January was something like 50 men, which is practically a third. These men represent some of our best American stock, the tribe of old-fashioned sailor, a gallant worker in all weathers. There is probably no finer body of men in the world. They have done magnificently in peace and did equally well in the war, but they can not be expected to continue in the service if they do not receive enough to support their families.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey, I understand, has also been so crippled by resignations that it will be difficult for them to carry on their chartings, a very serious condition for the Navy and merchant marine.

Mr. President, I believe the above data can not fail to impress anyone with the serious condition that we have to meet. The greatest thing for any fighting service is its morale, and we can not have a high morale when officers and men feel that they are being treated with injustice, and are continually worried by the fact that their families are not being adequately supported and are suffering privations. When this is aggravated by the knowledge that men in similar occupations are being adequately compensated, it is human nature that they will desire to change their condition, if possible, if not for their own sake, at least for that of those who are dependent upon them; and if they are unable to do this, there will be great dissatisfaction.

Apart from the psychological aspect, efficiency in such a highly centralized service as the Navy means years of experience and training. This training can not be properly carried out unless there are a large number of teachers, and the teachers are the

trained men of the service. The statistics I have quoted show that they are leaving in appalling numbers, and unless something is done very soon, if it is not already too late, the Navy will not be in a high state of efficiency for some years to come. The seriousness of a condition like this can not be questioned by anyone.

The Senate has refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles and enter into the League of Nations. If we are to go back to the old conditions that existed previous to our entry into the war and continue our policy of isolation there can be no question that we shall need a great and efficient Navy. The paramount importance of sea power has again been clearly demonstrated by this war, and I believe that a great and efficient Navy as a first line of defense is essential to America. From the earliest history of the Republic our Navy's record has been our pride, and this war was no exception to the rule. What it accomplished during the year and a half of hostilities is, I believe, something that the country will always point to as showing what America can do.

Hindsight is, of course, always better than foresight, and perhaps one thing or another might have been better done if it had been done differently, but that can never be proven. The fact remains, however, that the objects set out for were obtained and that no branch of the service failed in doing its duty, but did that duty splendidly and to the credit of its officers and its men.

The Senate to-day is conducting an investigation of what was done, and perhaps this may develop in the future in some sound suggestions for the improvement of the service. Up to date, however, there is only one thing that stands out as absolutely essential for the future welfare of our Navy, and that is that the officers and men should receive adequate compensation to meet the unparalleled living conditions. It is idle to criticize the Navy for this and that, or to talk of improving it by doing this or that, until Congress has passed an increased pay bill.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island to repeat his first statement concerning the disagreement of the conferees? I did not quite understand what has been done with a view to ameliorating this condition.

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator from California that I was informed this morning by one of the members of the conference committee that the conferees had again disagreed. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] probably can answer that question better, as he is a member of the conference committee.

Mr. PHELAN. Then I address my inquiry to the Senator from New York, if he will answer. The Senator from Rhode Island has just made an alarming statement as to the condition of the Navy, due to disagreement, as I understand, concerning pay, by the conferees on the subject of the Navy and Army pay bill; and I rise to inquire what is the condition in the conference, and whether there is likelihood of an agreement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, to-day the conferees adjourned until to-morrow morning. It is true that to-day they did not reach an agreement. The committee, however, has not decided to report a disagreement as yet. I feel as deeply about the question as does the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, without undertaking to criticize or reply to the address of the Senator from Rhode Island, I desire to call attention very briefly to one or two matters.

It is true that men were paid by the Shipping Board wages vastly in excess of the wages paid in the Navy, and it is undoubtedly true that the effect upon the Navy has not been good.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator that it is not only the Shipping Board that are paying very large wages; it is all the employers of sailormen.

Mr. REED. I desire to address myself to the single proposition. Months ago the Shipping Board obtained lists of the American sailors and employees on ships of the Navy. Months ago they learned what the wages of these men were, and when they arrived at American ports they were greeted with letters from the Shipping Board stating, and stating with accuracy, in substance, "Under your present employment you get so much per month; the Shipping Board will pay you so much more." So we had the spectacle of one branch of the Government service deliberately trying to rob the naval branch of the service of its men. I have that fact from a naval officer, who complained to me bitterly about it months ago, and stated that the Navy was losing men every day. It is only another proof of the fact that there ought to be some kind of a system of co-ordination between the different branches of the Government service.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I know nothing about the conditions to which the Senator refers, but I simply want to call his attention to the fact that no matter what the Shipping Board did, the situation of the Navy will be very serious unless the men are granted an increase of pay, and the crucial question is the increase of pay. That is a point that we must not forget.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am not discussing that phase of the question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I have heard from naval officers in whom I have entire confidence precisely the same statement which the Senator from Missouri has just quoted. There is no doubt but that the Shipping Board are paying a great deal more than private firms, and are drawing men directly away from the Navy, and it has a good deal to do with the necessity, which is very great, of raising the pay. But it also shows, as the Senator from Missouri said, the bidding of one branch of the Government against another in the matter of wages.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GERRY. I would like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he has any doubt of the absolute necessity of granting increases in pay?

Mr. LODGE. It is absolutely necessary if we are going to have any Navy at all.

Mr. GERRY. There is no question about it.

Mr. LODGE. There is no question about it whatever. But the great sinner in this thing has been the Shipping Board, spending Government money and offering unlimited pay, far higher than private yards, high as the pay is in those yards.

Mr. GERRY. Does not the Senator know that the private concerns are also offering a good deal higher pay than is paid by the Navy?

Mr. LODGE. The pay at private concerns, of course, is higher than that of the Navy.

Mr. GERRY. They would be drawing them away anyway, then.

Mr. LODGE. It is higher than the pay in private concerns, and it is the Government bidding against itself.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose a reasonable increase in pay for the Navy. But the Senator calls attention to the fact that greater pay is being given not only by private concerns but by the Shipping Board. I am calling attention to the fact that the Shipping Board, representing the Government, pursued the tactics and methods I have already described. The truth is that whoever was responsible for it in the Shipping Board ought to have been incontinently kicked out of his job within 10 minutes after the fact was discovered. It would be quite one thing for the Shipping Board to send to the employees at private concerns and tell them they would offer a better wage; but for the Shipping Board to get the pay roll of the employees of the American Navy, and then write each employee as he came into port that they would raise his wages, is about as intolerable, as impudent, and as senseless a thing as I have heard of in my life. We not only have done that, but similar occurrences have been frequent in other branches of the public service.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator from Missouri intimates, at least, that the men in the Navy should not be advised what other branches of the Government are paying for a given service. Does the Senator believe that because a man has enlisted in the Navy from patriotic motives he should be prevented from knowing what wages he could obtain in other branches of the service, and that he should be kept in ignorance of those facts?

Mr. REED. The Senator has the most peculiar mind of any man I ever knew. I think if he were to run the Lord's Prayer through his intellect he would be able to bring it out covered with suspicion and bearing evidence of artifice and fraud calculated to deceive even the Almighty. What I said was that that branch of the service got the pay roll of the Navy and sent to the men who came in a statement that they were receiving a certain amount of pay, and if they would quit the service of the Navy, "this patriotic service" the Senator talks about, and come over to another branch of the Government service not quite so patriotic, they would get more money. Thus the Government was bidding against itself. I did not talk about keep-

ing men in ignorance or anything of that sort. That is all the reply I care to make to that kind of a question. It was not a good-faith question.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I resent the latter statement made by the Senator, that the question was not asked in good faith. I insist that the Senator's argument was based upon the assumption that these enlisted men should not have information as to what was being paid in other branches of the service. While it may be true that the Shipping Board was bidding against some other branch of the service, yet what I sought to do was to get the views of the Senator as to whether the remedy which he suggested was the proper remedy or not, whether you should keep these men in ignorance or whether you should devise some plan for rectifying this evil, which we all admit.

There is no one in this Chamber who realizes more than I do that we ought not to have the different branches of the Government bidding against each other, but the remedy is not to keep people in ignorance; it is to bring about some arrangement whereby there shall be equal pay for equal service in all branches of the Government. The question I asked the Senator was asked in good faith for the purpose of developing that idea.

Mr. REED. The Senator speaks of the remedy I suggested and makes a speech about it. I had not suggested any remedy nor said a single word about a remedy. It is only another one of those peculiar intellectual quirks of the gentleman in which he so frequently indulges. I simply stated a fact, that the Shipping Board was bidding against the Government itself, and was trying to rob the Navy of its men at a time when the Navy needed its men, and I had not gotten along to the point of discussing the question of remedy at all.

I do not think any special pleader for the Shipping Board can in any manner mitigate the infamy of their conduct by claiming that they were engaged in the delectable business of merely disseminating information. They were not disseminating information; they were robbing the Navy of its men, and it was an outrageous piece of business.

Other branches of the service have done the same thing. One of the great evils we have had to contend with during this entire war has been the bidding by one branch of the Government against another branch of the Government. That has nothing to do with the question as to what are fair and just wages. It is a good deal on the level of two women who are friends, or supposed to be friends, each trying to get the other woman's servant away from her, although it is a good deal more foolish than that.

Mr. President, just one other thing the Senator from Rhode Island said to which I want to call attention. He declared that if we are going back to the old order, having rejected the treaty of peace, we must have a strong Navy. I wonder if the question of our having a strong Navy depends upon the rejection of the treaty of Versailles, the treaty of treason, the treaty of surrender, the treaty of peace, or whatever you want to call it.

Unfortunately for the Senator the record is written on that question, and it was written before the rejection of the treaty. It was written at a time when the administration expected the treaty to be affirmed out of hand. It was written at a time when the distinguished leader upon this side of the Chamber announced every morning that the treaty would be ratified the next morning, or thereabouts. That record is that the Secretary of the Navy had demanded \$913,000,000 for more fighting ships and a personnel for the Navy of 250,000 men.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. That was to carry out a program which was laid down in 1916.

Mr. REED. If it was to carry out a program laid down in 1916, which I deny, if we had determined to supplant the old order of affairs with the new millennium and the millennium was regarded as assured, what was the sense of going on and carrying out the old war program?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. LODGE. I may remind the Senator that it was not to carry out the old program; it was to add very largely to it; and it was done under the statement, made publicly by the Secretary of the Navy, that it was necessary to coerce England and have the greatest fleet in the world. We are carrying out the 1916 program now.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Massachusetts, with his usual clarity, has stated the case better than I could have stated it. I was going to make a somewhat similar statement.

You can not fool anybody by that sort of talk. The Secretary of the Navy is on record and the Secretary of War is on record and the Chief of Staff is on record that after the millennium is inaugurated, after the white doves of peace have become so numerous as to envelop the skies and shut out the light of the sun, it will still be necessary to have a standing Army nearly six times as great as we ever had, 578,000 men, to police the millennium, and 250,000 men in the Navy, and both the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff testified that the military program was necessary in order to redeem our obligations under the League of Nations.

Besides that they said we had to have universal military training—that is to say, universal military servitude—the forced draft of every boy of 19, which would have given us approximately 200,000 constantly in the Army, training, so we would have had over a million men as the permanent military and naval personnel of this country; and this was to be the condition after Christ had come to reign, with Japan and the British Empire as his vicegerents on earth.

More than that, since it has become certain that the treaty is about as dead as Julius Caesar, Congress has cut down the size of the Army program immensely. The first fruits that we have of going back to the old policy of Washington and Jefferson is that we are not to have as large an Army; we are not to have the forced draft of every boy of 19 under the euphonious and sweet-sounding name of military training. My only regret is that the military bill can not be modified so that we shall not have an Army of over 200,000 men. That is all we need.

I have said several times on the floor of the Senate, and I repeat, that I want some one to tell me who is coming here to whip the United States. The only countries that have any excuse to regard us with enmity are prostrate, either disarmed or dismembered. Are the countries with which we did propose to go into partnership in order to regenerate the world, and to which we recently rendered great service in the war, coming here to conquer us? If they are, the sooner you quit talking the miserable nonsense of a partnership with them the better for this country. I want no partnership with a man who stands ready to cut my throat; I want no partnership with a nation that I have just helped save—and I am speaking now of the country and not of myself—if it is ready to turn and put its knife at the throat of my country.

Mr. President, I have been led aside from what I rose to say. I only wanted to call attention to these two facts. So far as the Navy pay is concerned, I am willing to sit down with the other Senators and do whatever is just and right in that matter, and whatever is necessary. I believe that we ought to have the personnel of our Navy at a high standard of efficiency, and I believe that we ought to have a good Navy, for while I have never indulged in any of the dreams which have disturbed other people, and while I have never indulged in the fear that we are to be immediately attacked by any other country, nevertheless I recognize the fact that the building of a Navy is a matter of slow progress and of development; that no nation can afford to allow itself to be helpless—League of Nations or no League of Nations; that power is always respected; that as long as we are able to defend ourselves we may be sure that our rights will be taken care of; that as long as this country is a great, powerful country we will not be molested by other countries.

I am confidently of the opinion that if at the time the European war broke out we had begun taking some radical steps for preparation we might never have been dragged into that war. Germany twisted Uncle Sam's nose because it thought Uncle Sam could not or would not fight. Germany would not have made that mistake if we had been in a better state of preparation. Whatever you may say of the Army, it is true that a Navy is a matter of slow growth and of development, and I am in favor of the United States being in a position so that if she is ever challenged by any nation her war fleet will not be obliged to duplicate the performance of the German war fleet, run for protection under the guns of forts.

So I am in accord with the Senator's purpose to see that the pay of the Navy is adequate, always having due regard, of course, for economy, but I am not going to support any such measure because the Shipping Board bid against the Navy, neither am I going to support it on the theory that we have gone back to old conditions. We never got away from old conditions. Before they sat down at the peace table at Versailles, Great Britain served notice that she would not take a single vessel from her fleet, that she would not consider the question of the freedom of the seas. Her statesmen said they had the freedom of the seas and they intended to keep it. I am in favor of the United States of America being able to say the same thing.

ARMY REORGANIZATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3792) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the United States Army, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of Mr. HARRISON, which was, on page 52, lines 3 and 4, to strike out the words "lineal list of his own branch" and insert the words "relative list of the Regular Army"; and, on page 53, line 2, after the word "service," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no officer shall be placed on the list below any officer to whom he is at present senior on the relative list of the Regular Army.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to have to oppose the amendment offered by the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], for whom I have such a high regard. I have talked to a number of officers in the different branches of the service, some of whom will lose by the single-list promotion, and there is not one of them who does not approve of it and say it is the fairest plan by which the promotion of officers can be made.

There is one injustice that the bill will work, and that is with reference to the class which graduated at West Point in 1917 ahead of its time. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and had expected to offer an amendment, but I know he feels that to make an exception would be unwise. I hope, however, that when the bill gets into conference the conferees will take up the wonderful record of the class of 1918.

I am heartily in favor of the single list for promotion in the Regular Army. To my mind Congress could enact no legislation that would be more conducive to contentment among the officers than to require promotion to be made according to the length of commissioned service. This places all officers on the same basis, and no arm or department can feel that it is being discriminated against in the matter of promotions.

While I realize the danger of making any exceptions to the rule laid down in the bill, this rule works such injustice to one class of officers that I feel it is my duty to call it to the attention of the Senate.

The class of 1918 of the United States Military Academy was graduated August 30, 1917, and I believe it is recognized by all those familiar with their record that no class or group of officers rendered more distinguished service on the field of battle or made greater sacrifices than the class of 1918. As I previously stated, the class of 1918 was graduated August 30, 1917.

Of the 148 graduates, 111, or 75 per cent, served overseas prior to the signing of the armistice.

Ten members of the class were killed in action or died of wounds received in action, and 2 died of disease as a result of exposure in the campaign, a total of 12 deaths, this being 10.8 per cent of those who served overseas, or 8.1 per cent of the entire class.

Ten members of the class were wounded in action, making a total of 22 casualties overseas, this being 19.8 per cent of those who served overseas, or 14.8 per cent of the entire class.

Ten members, 9 per cent of those who served overseas, or 6.76 per cent of the entire class, were awarded the distinguished service cross.

Thirty-three graduates of the Military Academy were killed in action or died of wounds received in action. Of this number, 10, or 30.3 per cent, were members of the class of 1918.

The percentage of graduates of the class of 1918 with service overseas—75 per cent—is 26 per cent greater than the percentage—59.49 per cent—of all officers of the Regular Army with service overseas.

The percentage of the graduates of the class of 1918 that were killed in action or died of wounds received in action—6.8 per cent—is six and a half times as large as the percentage—1.065 per cent—of all officers of the entire Army who were killed in action or who died of wounds.

The percentage of graduates of the class of 1918 awarded the distinguished service cross—6.76 per cent—is nine and two-thirds times as large as the percentage—0.7 per cent—of officers of the entire Army awarded the distinguished service cross.

Fifteen days before the graduation of the class of 1918 of the United States Military Academy more than 27,000 young men were graduated from the first of the series of officers' training camps and commissioned in the Officers' Reserve Corps. Later, and subsequent to the graduation of the class of 1918, a number of these men were commissioned in the Regular Army, and there are now 893 of them in the Regular Army, all of whom are junior to the graduates of the class of 1918 of the United States Military Academy. If the bill as it now stands becomes a law, all of these 893 graduates of the first training camps will jump over and become senior to the graduates of the class of

1918 of the United States Military Academy. In addition to this, unless some provision is made, every one of the 27,000 graduates of the first training camp that is appointed to the Regular Army under this reorganization bill could and probably would be made senior in rank to the graduates of the class of 1918 of the United States Military Academy, who had been trained for more than three years, while those jumped over them were in training only three months.

While I do not underrate the work of the graduates of the training camps, I am sure no one would claim that the three months' military training they received in camp was equivalent to more than three years' training at the United States Military Academy. Because they happened to complete their course at the training camps 15 days before the graduation of the class of the Military Academy would not seem sufficient to justify their being jumped over these Military Academy graduates, who are now senior to them.

I would not take from the graduates of the training camps any of the rights or privileges they enjoy under the existing law. Eight hundred and ninety-three officers are nearly 11 per cent of the total number of commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army to-day. To jump such a large per cent of all the officers of the Regular Army over the members of the class of 1918 would very seriously retard their future promotion and would be most discouraging and disheartening to these young men who have rendered such arduous and distinguished service in defense of their country and in the cause of humanity on the field of battle. To take from these young men the rights and privileges they now enjoy under the law would, to my mind, be ungrateful, to say the least. I believe in rewarding those who have done the hardest fighting, regardless of their branch of the service or anything else, and certainly the record of this class of 1918 should be a pride to the Army and the people of our country.

Mr. President, I have opposed the provisions of this bill relative to the National Guard, and I think it is unjust to deprive the National Guard of the States of the rights that have heretofore been given them. The adjutant general of my State, many other National Guardsmen, and members of the Georgia State Militia, who rendered brilliant service in Cuba, Mexico, and France, have protested against the passage of this part of the measure.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I probably would not have said anything further touching this question had it not been for the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

I have no interest in the world in the amendment which I have offered. I want to see a good spirit in the Army. I voted for increased pay for the officers as well as for the enlisted men in the Army, and for increased pay for officers in the Navy. I offered a resolution in the Senate, and the Senate adopted it, calling on the Secretary of War to know why such gross unfairness was practiced by the General Staff in the demotion of officers. Everything I have done has been with an eye single to adding to the spirit and the morale of the Army.

I have offered this amendment with the same purpose. I believe the effect of it will be to bring about that result. I believe it, and believe conscientiously, that if the provision is adopted as embodied in the bill it will cause demoralization among the officers in the Engineer branch as well as the Artillery and perhaps the Ordnance. That is the sole object of offering the amendment. The issue is clearly joined. If a majority of the Senate want to adopt the plan of the single list and let it be retroactive, as is provided in the bill, then that is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. On that question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. I call for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi calls for a division on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. I am asking for division on the question whether the yeas and nays shall be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Mississippi that one-fifth of the Senators present did not second the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Comer	Frellinghuysen	Gronna
Brandeggee	Curtis	Gerry	Hale
Chamberlain	Dial	Glass	Harris

Harrison	Lodge	Pittman	Sterling
Henderson	McCumber	Pomerene	Sutherland
Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Ransdell	Swanson
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Reed	Thomas
Kellogg	Myers	Sheppard	Trammell
Kendrick	New	Simmons	Underwood
Keyes	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wadsworth
King	Page	Smith, S. C.	Warren
Kirby	Phelan	Smoot	Wolcott
Lenroot	Phipps	Spencer	

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained on official business.

Mr. GRONNA. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], upon which he asks for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANSDELL. I offer an amendment, which I have previously presented. It comes in on page 20. I will ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 20, line 5, after the words "major general," it is proposed to insert the words "2 assistant chiefs of engineers with the rank of brigadier general," so that the section will read as follows:

SEC. 22. Corps of Engineers: The permanent personnel of the Corps of Engineers shall consist of 1 Chief of Engineers with the rank of major general, 2 Assistant Chiefs of Engineers with the rank of brigadier general, and 900 officers and 16,000 enlisted men, in their appropriate grades, all of whom shall be detailed or assigned from the permanent personnel as provided for in this act. The reserve personnel shall consist of all reserve officers and reservists of the organized reserve and National Guard of the United States assigned to Engineer Corps units as provided for in this act.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to add two general officers in the Corps of Engineers of the Army. There is one Chief of Engineers at the present time with the rank of major general, and I should like to add two brigadier generals.

I have had prepared a statement in regard to this amendment to which I will ask the attention of the Senate, as it is a matter of considerable importance.

The amendment will not increase the number of brigadier generals, which is fixed at 50 by section 12, page 9, line 22 of the pending bill, and hence it will not increase the cost of the Army. The purpose is to recognize by law the need for two Assistant Chiefs of Engineers and to insure that these officers shall be available for duty in the office of the Chief of Engineers irrespective of changes of policy due to changes of personnel in the General Staff or in the War Department. The Secretary of War in his hearings before the congressional Committees on Military Affairs has advocated legislation authorizing two such assistants.

The need for these two assistants has existed for a great many years, but it has been greatly intensified in recent times. The diagram hereto attached indicates the functions of the Corps of Engineers and the great number and variety of duties devolving upon the Chief of Engineers. It indicates also the proper functional organization of the office of the Chief of Engineers and the duties to be performed by his two principal assistants, who should have the title of Assistant Chiefs of Engineers with the rank and pay of brigadier general.

It is to be noted that there are a great number of administrative duties to which, in compliance with law, the Chief of Engineers must devote his personal attention. These are connected with works, activities, and institutions of a miscellaneous, civil, and military nature. They are indicated in the diagram in the upper left corner. These duties render the position of the Chief of Engineers quite different from that of the chiefs of other combatant arms and staff services of the Army; they require for their performance a large part of the time of the Chief of Engineers.

I will read from the diagram referred to the duties of this officer, so that they may be clearly before the Senate.

Duties requiring personal attention of the Chief of Engineers: He is a member of the Rock Creek Park Commission; of the Board of Control of Rock Creek Park; of the committee on suburban highways of the District of Columbia; a member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications; a member of the board of commissioners, Soldiers' Home; of the board of commissioners, United States military prison at Fort Leavenworth; of the board of review, a war activity which has been terminated; of the subcommittee of the committee on engineering and education, Council of National Defense, a war activity which has also been terminated; chairman of the advisory board, Port and Harbors Facilities Commission, United States

Shipping Board, another war activity which has been terminated; of the board for fireproof laboratories, and so forth, of the Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, Pa.

He is obliged to make recommendations in connection with the following matters: The establishment of anchorage grounds; bridges, dams, dikes, and causeways in navigable rivers; permits for structures in navigable waters; occupation of Federal structures in connection with navigable waters; allotment of various indefinite appropriations for operating canals, snag boats, and so forth; charges for benefits arising from storage dams; modifications in plans for construction of canals; and adjustments arising from collisions.

Those are his purely civil duties. In addition, the military duties requiring the personal attention of the Chief of Engineers are as follows: He is in charge of the whole Engineer Corps, which, according to the bill under consideration—Senate bill 3792—will number 900 officers and 16,000 enlisted men, and under the House bill—No. 12775—600 officers and 12,000 enlisted men. The Chief of Engineers is technical adviser to the Chief of Staff and the General Staff on (1) all matters of engineer policy for the Army; (2) training and employment of Engineer troops and engineering duties of other troops.

He has to look after the assignment of the Engineer personnel, the field equipment for the Engineer troops and the Engineer equipment of all troops; to see to the training (a) of officers, including special service schools; (b) enlisted men, including schools and troops in the field; (c) training in appropriate engineering duties of all officers and troops; and also has duties to perform in connection with officers furnished to the Panama Canal and the District of Columbia.

There are a great many duties which under my amendment would be performed by one or the other of these brigadier generals. One of them would be assigned to civil duties and the other to military duties.

The civil duties to be performed by one of the brigadier generals would be as follows:

- River and harbor works:
- Ten territorial divisions.
- Fifty-three territorial districts.
- Examination, surveys, and reports.
- Estimates.
- Execution of works.
- Maintenance and operation of works.
- Board for Rivers and Harbors.
- California Débris Commission.
- Mississippi River Commission.
- Flood control.
- Operating snagboats.

Under the miscellaneous civil works to be performed by the brigadier general in charge of civil works are the following:

- Leases of water powers on Government dams.
- Establishment and regulation of harbor lines.
- Recommendations for and supervision of operation of bridges over navigable waters.
- Recommendations for and enforcement of rules for the navigation of navigable waters.
- Recommendation for and supervision of removal of wrecks.
- Supervision of Alaska Road Commission.
- Supervision of supervisor, New York Harbor.
- Supervision and operation, Lake Survey.
- Erection of the new Aqueduct Bridge in the District of Columbia.

- Erection of various memorials.
- Preservation of Niagara Falls.
- Washington Aqueduct, District of Columbia.
- Conduit Road in the District of Columbia.
- Public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia.
- Supervision of anchorage grounds.
- Supervision of the erection of dams, dikes, bridges, and causeways in navigable waters.

Supervision of erection of structures in navigable waters (concurrent authority).

Supervision of the occupation of Federal structures and lands on navigable waters.

Those are some of the civil duties that would be performed by one of the brigadiers under my amendment. Now, I come to the military duties to be performed by the other brigadier general.

- Supply staff service:
- Estimates for engineer supplies.

Development of equipment for construction, engineer equipment for fortifications, field searchlights, ranging, and so forth.

Procurement, production, and accounting for engineer supplies; railroad equipment, except railroad artillery mounts; electrical equipment in fortifications, field searchlights, tugs,

barges, lighters, and so forth; cranes, rails, and accessories; power generating sets; field construction machinery, ranging equipment, and spare parts for above.

Technical adviser on specifications for all types of engineering equipment.

Under the operating staff service, he would advise in regard to 9 territorial departments, 6 territorial divisions, 22 territorial districts.

Separate engineer staff functions in corps and larger units.

Under fortifications, he would advise in regard to sites, plans, estimates, construction and maintenance, power plant and electric installation, and location of buildings.

In military mapping, he would advise in regard to estimates for field work, reproduction, distribution, membership on board of surveys and maps, Federal Government.

In connection with military roads, railroads, and bridges, he would advise in regard to examination, estimates, construction, repair, and maintenance, and various items of military construction.

A vast variety of duties come under the Chief of Engineers, and many of them would be performed by these two assistants.

Aside from these duties, the Chief of Engineers is:

First. The chief of a combatant arm of the service consisting of 16,000 enlisted men under the terms of the bill—over 300,000 men during the World War.

Second. The chief of a military staff service, which in turn comprises two major activities: (a) A supply service—analogue to the ordnance service—which procures, stores, and issues supplies of a technical nature for its own use and for the Army as a whole; and (b) an operating service charged with the construction, repair, and maintenance of seacoast fortifications and frontier defenses, when required, the construction of military railways and military roads, the conduct of military mapping operations, and in time of war construction of all sorts within the theater of operations.

Third. The execution of river and harbor improvements throughout the United States and its island possessions, including enforcement of laws for the protection of navigation.

In the bill as drawn the Chief of Engineers has been recognized as the chief of a combatant arm only and he has been placed on a parity with the chiefs of Infantry, Cavalry, Coast Artillery, and other combatant services, each of which is provided with a chief with the rank of major general.

I call attention to the fact that the Chief of Engineers, who is charged with so many and such important civil duties, is treated in this bill solely as the head of a combatant arm of the service and placed on a parity with the other combatant arms of the service.

The bill, however, takes no cognizance whatever of the other multifarious duties of the Corps of Engineers, either as a supply staff service or as an operating staff service, nor does it take any cognizance of the river and harbor work and other miscellaneous civil duties of the Corps of Engineers.

If it be granted that the Chief of Engineers can personally perform the duties of a chief of a combatant force of 16,000 enlisted men, he will, nevertheless, require assistants with proper rank and experience to perform the technical staff duties which devolve upon his office and also to administer the river and harbor activities under his jurisdiction.

These military staff duties involve the supervision of an annual expenditure of millions of dollars for purchase of technical supplies, for construction and maintenance of fortifications and military railways, the conduct of military mapping and engineer operations in the field. These duties are greatly increased in time of war, and the office of the Chief of Engineers must always be so organized and administered as to permit of ready expansion in an emergency.

The Corps of Engineers differs from all other branches of the Army in that it has charge of river and harbor improvements. This work is provided for by the annual river and harbor appropriation acts, and its present magnitude is indicated by the expenditures made during the past 20 years, as follows:

Average annual expenditure (1900-1919)	\$29,567,681.82
Maximum annual expenditure (1914)	49,320,425.55
Minimum annual expenditure (1902)	14,902,980.74
Total for 20 years (1900-1919)	591,353,636.40

The above figures do not include expenditures on account of the following activities, viz: United States lake survey; preservation of Niagara Falls; Alaska Road Commission; public buildings and grounds, District of Columbia; Washington Aqueduct; Anacostia Park improvement; Potomac River bridges (Key Bridge, Aqueduct Bridge, and Highway Bridge); monuments and memorials outside the District of Columbia, national parks.

The river and harbor act of October 2, 1914, and that for March 4, 1915, made lump-sum appropriations of \$20,000,000 and \$25,000,000, respectively, and the pending river and harbor bill as it passed the House carries a lump-sum appropriation of \$12,400,000, to which the Senate has added about \$8,000,000, the bill pending before us carrying something over \$20,000,000. These lump-sum appropriations involve additional work and responsibility for the Chief of Engineers and for his assistants, owing to the fact that they must prepare estimates of the amount to be allotted by the Secretary of War to the various localities needing improvement. This task demands intimate knowledge of the requirements of each locality, of the relative urgency of the respective projects, and the Chief of Engineers must be able to controvert with sound argument the vast number of claims presented by local interests seeking larger allotments for their respective localities.

Mr. President, I can testify personally how important the work of the Engineer Corps is in connection with river and harbor expenditures. I have had more or less connection with that work ever since I entered Congress 21 years ago. I know it has been done in a most faithful, efficient, and able way. It is growing more and more all the time, and certainly there should be a brigadier general in charge of this work under the Chief of Engineers, who has so many other duties to perform, and who can not possibly perform all these river and harbor functions himself.

This work connected with rivers and harbors is administered by a section in the office of the Chief of Engineers with a field organization covering the entire United States and island possessions. The territory is divided into engineer districts which, in turn, are grouped into territorial divisions, each under the administration of a colonel or other higher officer of the Corps of Engineers. There is, in addition, a large civilian personnel averaging 23,000 to 25,000 employees and a tremendous amount of equipment. Although the administration is decentralized to the greatest possible extent, the work devolving upon the office of the Chief of Engineers is nevertheless very great.

I suppose we will be told by the chairman of the committee that we do not need two brigadier generals to assist in handling a force of only 16,000 men.

Mr. President, there are fully 25,000 civilian employees, many of them of high rank, magnificent men, of the highest order of intellect among the civilian engineers of this country, who are engaged in work on rivers and harbors under the Engineer Corps of the Army. So you can add to the 16,000 men given regularly to the Engineer Corps in this bill 25,000 civilian employees engaged in river and harbor work, making a total under the Engineer Corps of fully 40,000 men.

It includes the preparation of the annual estimates for river and harbor improvements, the presentation of data required by Congress, the allotment of funds, the examination and review of projects for improvements, the supervision of all contracts and agreements for work, the issue of permits for bridges and other miscellaneous civil activities connected with the Alaska Road Commission, the Mississippi River Commission, the California Débris Commission, the Washington Aqueduct, Public Buildings and Grounds in the District of Columbia, and other miscellaneous duties.

With the increase in population and wealth of the United States the magnitude and the number of duties of the Chief of Engineers have steadily increased until now it is humanly impossible for one officer to discharge all of these duties and give to each a careful and conscientious study which it requires. Assistants must be provided upon whom the Chief of Engineers can rely. These must be men of mature judgment and extended experience. They must, in fact, be the best men to be had. They should have pay commensurate with their responsibilities and should have rank which will place them in the proper relation to the officers coming under their jurisdiction in the field.

It has always seemed strange to me, Mr. President, to have a colonel here in Washington directing a number of colonels throughout the country engaged in river and harbor work. Men with the rank of colonel throughout the country engaged in these important works should have as their immediate chief and director in Washington a man certainly with the rank of brigadier general. Their duties are very onerous, involve great responsibility, and the supervision over a large number of officers. These duties exceed in magnitude and importance the duties of any ordinary brigade commander, either in peace or in war. Civilians occupying analogous positions in the industrial world now receive anywhere from \$20,000 to \$100,000 per annum.

As a matter of comparison it may be noted that the bill provides the Quartermaster Corps, which is a purely supply service, with one chief with the rank of major general and two assistants with the rank of brigadier general.

I hope Senators will pay attention to this branch of the bill and my comments thereon. The Quartermaster Corps, I repeat, has one major general and two assistants with the rank of brigadier general.

It provides for the Ordnance Service—another purely supply service, the duties of which, in my humble opinion, do not compare in importance with those of the Chief of Engineers—one chief with the rank of major general and two assistant chiefs with the rank of brigadier general. It provides for the Medical Service, which is a combined supply and operating staff service, one chief with the rank of major general and two assistant chiefs with the rank of brigadier general.

Mr. President, I have no criticism whatsoever to make of the wisdom of the committee in giving a major general and two assistants with the rank of brigadier to these three great branches of the service—the Quartermaster Corps, the Ordnance Service, and the Medical Corps—but I insist that the Engineer Corps of the Army, with its large number of civilian employees, 25,000 of them scattered throughout the land, is surely as important as any one of these three, and if they are to be given two brigadier generals, the Engineer Corps should be given two brigadier generals.

The duties of the Corps of Engineers, including its combatant functions, its supply functions, its fortification, mapping, and miscellaneous construction functions, and its river and harbor functions are certainly no less in importance and magnitude than the duties of the three staff bureaus above mentioned, and it should be provided with the officers necessary to discharge its responsibilities.

In view of the foregoing, which is believed to be a conservative statement of facts, it is submitted that the bill should provide at least two Assistant Chiefs of Engineers with the rank of brigadier general. The duties of these two assistant chiefs are indicated in the diagram hereto attached but may be verbally presented as follows: (a) First Assistant Chief of Engineers (brigadier general) in charge of river and harbor improvements and miscellaneous activities devolving upon the Corps of Engineers, including the enforcement of laws for the protection of navigation. (b) Second Assistant Chief of Engineers (brigadier general) in charge of duties connected with the development, procuring, storage, and issuing of technical supplies required for the Army, and in charge of the construction and maintenance of coast fortifications and frontier defenses, the supervision of military mapping, the construction and operation of military railways, and miscellaneous engineer staff duties.

Even with these two assistants, the Chief of Engineers himself will be fully occupied with the general supervision of the activities devolving upon the Corps of Engineers as a combatant service consisting of 16,000 troops in time of peace—over 300,000 during the World War—and with the discharge of duties of a special nature which are now devolved upon him in his own person by law, by regulations, or by orders of the Secretary of War, as well as the general supervision of the entire Corps of Engineers and the Engineer Department at large.

Aside from the important duties requiring these two Assistant Chiefs of Engineers, there enters the question of incentive and reward and its bearing on the contentment and morale of the officers commissioned in the Corps of Engineers. The bill provides for 900 officers of Engineers, with one general officer only at the head of the corps. The ratio between general officers and officers of less rank within the Corps of Engineers is thus 1 to 900.

I call the attention of Senators to this proposition; the ratio of general officers to the other officers in this corps is 1 to 900. This condition should be contrasted with that obtaining in the other staff services provided for in the bill, viz:

In the Quartermaster Service the ratio is 1 to 117, in the Ordnance Service it is also 1 to 117, and in the Chemical Warfare Service it is 1 to 125. In the Army as a whole it is about 1 to 217, and 1 to 900 in the Corps of Engineers. Why this discrimination, Mr. President? I can not understand it. Thus, with three general officers in the Corps of Engineers, which will be the result of the amendment I have proposed, the ratio for Engineer officers will be 1 to 300; that is to say, conditions will be even more disproportionate in the Corps of Engineers than in the other staff services even if my amendment be agreed to, and the grossest discrimination against the Engineer Corps will exist in the Army if my amendment be not agreed to.

From this point of view there is thus a penalty attached to service in the Corps of Engineers as compared with service in the other branches of the Army, and this notwithstanding that for the discharge of its duties the Corps of Engineers requires men of the very best intellectual capacity. For over 117 years, since the inception of the United States Military Academy, it has been the practice to take into the Corps of Engineers only

those graduates of that institution who have stood at the top of their respective classes. The few additional officers who in recent years have been drawn from civil life are not only graduates of the very best technical schools of the country but have been obliged to pass severe examinations prior to receiving a commission in the Army. It is feared that if the discrimination against the Corps of Engineers which the bill now carries is not removed we shall not be able to attract to that corps the graduates of the Military Academy, nor graduates of other technical institutions of the quality necessary to maintain the high standards of the Engineer service, or, in fact, to carry on the duties of the Corps of Engineers in a satisfactory manner. It will not be to the personal interest of such a graduate to enter the Corps of Engineers nor to remain in the Corps for any great length of time, even if he should enter, for there is a premium attached to duty in other arms of the service, the average being, as I have said, one general officer to 215 officers throughout the Army as a whole, and in the Engineer Corps, as now proposed to be constituted by this bill, 1 to 900. What incentive will there be for men to enter the Engineer Corps? This incentive will operate as a strong inducement to officers of the Corps of Engineers to seek service by detail in such other arms and to neglect their own development as engineers.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take up more of the time of the Senate in discussing this measure. It seems to me that the amendment I have proposed is of the utmost importance, it is eminently fair to this great branch of the Army, and I sincerely hope that the chairman of the committee will not oppose it, but will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think a proper understanding of the status of the Engineer Corps, as provided in the bill, will do very much toward relieving the Senator of the impression that that corps is discriminated against by the failure of the committee to allow two brigadier generals as assistant chiefs.

Under the terms of the bill the Engineer Corps are made combat troops, placed upon the same basis as the Infantry, the Cavalry, the Field Artillery, the Coast Artillery, the Signal Corps, and the Air Corps. Being made combat troops, an officer of the Engineers is eligible for a brigadier generalship of the line, just as an Infantry officer, a cavalryman, a field artilleryman, or a coast artilleryman. There is no limit to the number of officers from the Engineer Corps who may be promoted to the grade of brigadier general of the line.

The incentive under the terms of the bill for officers to join the Engineer Corps and serve in it, in my humble judgment, is greater than at any former time; for, whether they could contend before that they were combat troops and their men eligible for brigadier generalships of the line and major generalships in the line, the matter was not entirely clear, and many members of the corps labored under the impression that when it came to the matter of promotion to the grade of brigadier general in the line, an Engineer officer was apt to be discriminated against. The bill places the Engineers upon exactly the same basis as the Infantry, Cavalry, and other combat branches. So the Engineers will have the same opportunity for promotion to the higher grades as every other combat branch.

Mr. RANSDELL. Does the Senator think it would be at all probable that an Engineer officer could be given an increased rank in any combat forces, except possibly in time of war, when their very great ability, as has been demonstrated in past wars, has brought about their promotion?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes; in time of peace it is entirely possible. In fact, the President only the other day sent to the Senate the nomination of Col. Jervy to be brigadier general in the line. He is an Engineer officer.

Mr. RANSDELL. Can the Senator give any other illustration besides that one?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think Gen. W. B. Connor is an Engineer. I know there are others, but I can not recollect their names offhand. That is the new idea in the service, and the bill is intended to perpetuate it. They are combat troops.

May I call attention to the proportions which the Senator has mentioned as existing under the bill between general officers of the different services and the other services? In the first place, the Senator probably has forgotten that we have amended the bill so that the Engineer Corps now, instead of having 900 officers, has 600. So the ratio of one general officer to 900 officers is a little inaccurate. It ought to be one general officer to 600 officers.

We will turn to the Air Corps, which is also not only a combat service, but in part a supply service. It supervises the manufacture of aeroplanes and motors. In that corps we

have one chief of corps, with the rank of major general, and 1,550 officers, a much higher proportion of officers below the grade of general. In that corps the proportion is 1 to 1,550. In the Cavalry it is 1 to 950. In the Coast Artillery it is 1 to 1,200. In the Field Artillery it is 1 to 1,900. In the Infantry it is 1 to 4,500. In the Engineers it is 1 to 600. The smallest proportion of all is in the Engineers.

The committee considered the matter of assistant chief of this service, especially in connection with our consideration of the Engineer Corps, with the greatest care, and we have done the very best we can to lay out a workable plan by which each and every service will be able to function efficiently. The House bill carries one brigadier general as assistant chief in the Corps of Engineers. This bill carries none.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] offers to amend the bill by adding two brigadier generals. My own impression is that the corps does not need two brigadier generals inside of its own organization, especially when we consider the fact that the incentive for promotion under the bill is as high as that in any other branch of the service. The committee gave this subject its special attention, and I think that the amendment should not be agreed to.

My secretary has just handed me a list of some Engineer officers who have been promoted and who have served as officers in the line.

Mr. RANSDELL. In time of peace?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; Gen. Biddle, Gen. Kuhn, Gen. Sibert, Gen. Hodges, and Gen. McArthur, now superintendent of the West Point Military Academy, confirmed by the Senate a little while ago, and who is an Engineer officer. So it is not unusual, and it is going to be very frequent in the future.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator kindly tell us what civil service Gen. Sibert and Gen. Hodges performed as generals except in connection with the Panama Canal? They were not generals when they went there. I remember their service very well. They were sent from the Engineer Corps of the Army because they were very fine engineers, to assist in building the Panama Canal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is very true, but since that—

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator might have mentioned Gen. Goethals, who was there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But he is not in the same category. He has never been a major general of the line that I can recollect, though he may have been. Gen. Sibert is a major general of the line of the Army.

Mr. RANSDELL. He was appointed a general because of his eminent service upon the Panama Canal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Whatever the reason for his appointment, he was nominated and confirmed as a major general of the line and is serving as such now.

Mr. RANSDELL. I think the Senator will find upon an investigation that Gen. Sibert was given that high rank, and I believe some others were also given it, because of eminent civilian service as engineers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; I do not deny that, but that is still possible.

Mr. RANSDELL. It was not a purely military service. The Senator is basing his argument, as I understand it, upon the fact that the other combat arms of the service have the same number of ranking officers as the Engineers. He treats this purely as a combat service, and my contention is that it is a very important civil service, that the civil service is just as important as the military service, and a very large number of men are engaged in the civil service. I showed in my remarks that we have fully 25,000 men in that service, and the very men to whom the Senator has alluded made a wonderful record as civilians on the Panama Canal work. I know particularly about Gen. Sibert and Gen. Hodges.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My recollection is not entirely clear. I think Gen. Goethals is a major general of the line. I am quite sure that he is. So the incentive is just as strong in the Engineer Corps as in any other branch of the Army. We have several instances of Engineer officers being promoted to the position of brigadier general or major general as a reward, of course, for distinguished service. That is why every officer gets promotion to that rank; it is for distinguished service in whatever branch he serves in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move to reconsider the vote whereby the committee amendment on page 70 beginning at line 5 down to and including line 14 was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. After consultation with the Senator from South Carolina I will say that I have no objection to a reconsideration of the vote by which that amendment was agreed to, and then disagreeing to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment on page 70 beginning with line 5 of the bill was agreed to. Without objection the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I now ask that the amendment be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator from New York with reference to the provisions on page 66 about aliens entering into the training service. I spoke to him about it the other day. No action has been taken, and I think we should really strike out beginning with line 18.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That matter has been discussed since the bill was changed from one involving universal military training to that of voluntary training. I have discussed it with several Senators and there seems to be a disposition to agree that it should be taken out. I rather imagine that it would be taken out in conference, but I am perfectly willing to have it disposed of here.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then I move to amend by striking out the paragraph on page 66, beginning in line 18 with the words "any male alien" and extending down to and including line 15 on page 67.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 52, lines 2, 3, and 4, strike out the words "without changing the present position of any officer on the lineal list of his own branch, but otherwise as nearly as practicable"; on page 52, line 5, before the word "length," insert the word "total"; and on page 52, line 5, after the word "service," insert the words "in the United States service."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in the discussion of the single list this matter has already been pretty fully discussed. I believe the single list for promotion is undoubtedly the best method of promoting officers in the Army, and I think the provision for a single list is a proper one; but I believe it ought to be based entirely upon the length of commissioned service. If the words are stricken out that I have moved to strike out, it will make the single list based entirely upon the length of commissioned service.

It is claimed that this happened a long time ago, and the inequity that these Spanish War officers have suffered has been suffered so long that it ought not now to be corrected. It is one of the purposes of the bill to correct inequalities of promotion that have heretofore existed in the Army, and I believe that when you correct one you should correct all.

It has been stated here that no complaint has ever been made. I find that a bill was introduced as far back as 1903 to make this correction. The truth is that young men who graduated from the Military Academy were placed ahead of young men who had volunteered in the Spanish War and had fought for their country at that time. That discrimination ought not to have been made at the time, and now is the best time in the world to correct it.

As was developed in the argument over the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the bill undertakes to iron out the inequalities that have heretofore existed, and we ought to iron them all out and base the matter wholly upon the length of commissioned service. The lineal list, in order to be fair, must have a basis that is fixed and determined, and not leave it to some one to arrange. I hardly know who would have the right to arrange the list. The wording of the bill is as follows:

shall be placed on the list without changing the present position of any officer on the lineal list of his own branch.

That gives to the War Department the right to continue this discrimination. I do not think it ought to be allowed. I am not going to discuss it further. I think all Senators know exactly what it is. It is a question of doing justice to these young men who fought for their country from 1898 to 1901. If we are going to do justice by the other Army officers and make the promotion equal and uniform throughout the Army, we ought to make it so for these officers who fought in that war.

Surely if there is any class of officers who are entitled to fair treatment in the method of promotion, it is the men who have actually fought during time of war. I submit that we should correct existing inequalities all at one time. The only way whereby we shall ever have an agreement that the adjustment is

fair, is to make it absolutely fair from beginning to end, and to base rank entirely upon commissioned service. Then we shall have no more trouble about promotions, and no more special bills to promote men in the Army.

Mr. President, if there is nothing more to be said on the matter, I ask for a vote by yeas and nays.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, just a word on this matter, which was debated to some extent a day or so ago. It is a question to which the committee has given a good deal of attention in making up the initial single list for promotion. As I said the other day, this situation arose back in 1901. It seems that at that time the Congress authorized the admission into the Regular service as officers of a group of officers who had served as volunteer officers during the Spanish-American War. It is to be assumed that at that time the Congress took into consideration the places which those officers were to occupy in their several grades in relation to the Regular officers with whom they were merged. Congress in that day inserted a provision apparently that these volunteer officers should not be credited for their service as such volunteer officers, but should in effect go de novo into the Regular service.

Is it fair to assume that that was an expression on the part of Congress which was expected to stand? It was a legislative act; it was an act of discretion, and the officers took their places under that provision of law. Since then there has been no disturbance of that provision of which I am aware. Neither am I aware that there has been any concerted move to have that old law of 1901 changed. Since 1901 down to the present year, 1920—practically 19 years—these officers have gone along in their original status as provided by that act of Congress in 1901. They have had their promotions from time to time, and most of those who went in as second lieutenants or first lieutenants at that day are undoubtedly majors and lieutenant colonels to-day.

The matter has been long settled, and apparently, in view of the fact that there has been no concerted action in all this time to change that law of 1901, the situation has been accepted by the majority of them.

Now we come to write a promotion list, and it is proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, in effect, to repeal the act of 1901 and to put this little group of officers upon the promotion list in the places which they would occupy upon that list if Congress had not expressed its desire and its preference in the act of 1901. The impression of the committee is that that is going too far back; that the situation has been accepted for too long a time; and that were we to do what the Senator from Tennessee suggests we would disrupt a settled state of affairs. In fact, my own information is that some of these officers—perhaps not many of them—by reason of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would be jumped 300 numbers over the heads of men under whom they have been rated for 19 years. I think the disruption would be too great to warrant attempting to repeal that old act.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will permit me to ask him a question, I desire to say that I did not catch the explanation as to the law of 1901, which provided for the status of the Regular officers who served as volunteer officers in the war with Spain.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The act of 1901 in providing for admission into the Regular Army of a certain number of volunteer officers who served in the Spanish-American War provided at the same time that in assigning those men to the Regular service in their respective grades no credit should be given for the length of time during which they had served as volunteer officers. They came into the service and took their places without that credit. Now it is proposed, 19 years later, to give them that credit in the arrangement of the single list, though the situation has been accepted for 19 years.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is proposed to give them all credit for the time that they served as volunteers in the Spanish-American War?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. They came into the Army knowing full well that they were not going to have that credit, because the Congress of that day said they should not have it. Now the Senator from Tennessee asks that they be given that credit.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But these officers having been incorporated into the Regular Army will get their promotion necessarily under this provision as their length of service justifies.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes; except that their volunteer service in the Spanish-American War will not count.

Mr. McKELLAR. That part of their service during which they were fighting for their country in the Spanish-American War will be excepted; that will be entirely left out.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As I understand the Senator from New York, under the act of 1901, the officers referred to went into the Regular Army with a full understanding of the law and knowing that they would not get that credit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and they have ever since been complaining of the inequalities of the law. If we are to put all officers on the single list, why should we discriminate against these young men who started their careers by fighting for their country? Because Congress has discriminated against them heretofore is no reason why we should now discriminate against them. If we are going to put them all on the basis of length of commissioned service—and that is the only way it ought to be done—why not make the rule apply to all those who have been in the service of the United States as commissioned officers for the whole length of such service?

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the floor, but I will gladly yield.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I happen to recall the circumstances surrounding the admission of these volunteer officers into the commissioned personnel of the Regular Army. As the Senator from Tennessee will remember, the Spanish-American War was not an extended war, so a great many of the officers did not get into action and had next to no military training. The argument, which was irrefutable, then was that these officers should not be put in along with those who had spent years in acquiring a military education, for they would have to be educated along military lines after they came in, which was a fact. They were admitted, and then were sent to Army service schools for one, two, three, or four years, which, so far as their actual service was concerned, was lost time to the Government of the United States. They received the Regular Army pay and allowances while they were obtaining the training which was requisite to put them on an equal footing with other officers. For that reason the law to which the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], has referred was enacted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, assuming that the Senator from Wyoming is correct as to that, the same thing exactly is true of graduates from West Point. Their service is counted from the time they enter the academy and not when they leave it, and yet it is proposed to put them ahead of the young men who were commissioned following their service in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. West Point service is not credited on the single list.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been, as I understand, in the case of those who have heretofore graduated from West Point. Their service has been counted from the time they entered the academy, including their service at West Point.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not under the single-list provision. We are now discussing the single-list provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will have that effect. Length of service has been computed from the time they entered the academy, and now it is proposed to give them the benefit of that and to exclude from consideration the service rendered by officers who were fighting for the country at the time of the Spanish-American War. The provision is not at all fair to those officers. All ought to be treated alike, and especially officers who served as volunteers in time of war ought to have as much credit for the service they actually rendered in war as other officers have for the time they spent in the academy.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, on which he asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. As I am unable to secure a transfer I will withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. I ask to be counted for a quorum.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. In his absence I am not at liberty to vote, and can not secure a transfer of the pair. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] on official business.

Mr. GLASS. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent on account of illness. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MOSES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The roll call resulted—yeas 20, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Ashurst	Gronna	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Harris	Pittman	Trammell
Comer	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Underwood
Dial	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott

NAYS—27.

Brandegge	Henderson	Lodge	Pomerene
Calder	Jones, Wash.	McCormick	Smoot
Curtis	Kellogg	McNary	Spencer
Dillingham	Keyes	Moses	Sutherland
France	Kirby	Myers	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Knox	New	Warren
Hale	Lenroot	Page	

NOT VOTING—49.

Ball	Fall	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry
Beckham	Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris
Borah	Fletcher	Kendrick	Owen
Capper	Gay	Kenyon	Penrose
Colt	Gerry	King	Phelan
Culbertson	Gore	La Follette	Phipps
Cummins	Harding	McCumber	Poin Dexter
Edge	Harrison	McLean	Reed
Elkins	Hitchcock	Nelson	Robinson

Sherman
Shields
Simmons
Smith, Ga.

Smith, Md.
Stanley
Sterling
Swanson

Thomas
Townsend
Walsh, Mont.
Watson

Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] the yeas are 20 and the nays are 27, Senators Kendrick and Thomas being present and not voting, thus constituting a quorum. The amendment is rejected. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if there is no other amendment pending I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. On last Monday, I believe, he offered an amendment, which was adopted without discussion, reducing the number of officers in the Corps of Engineers from 900 to 600. That was a much larger proportion of decrease than in the other branches of the service. I have some data here that show that they now need at least 623 officers in the Engineer Corps. Before the war, I believe, there were 502 officers in the Engineer branch of the service. Very frequently it has been the case—I know I have experienced it myself—that in doing river and harbor work the War Department was not able to make any new districts or even to place officers in the old districts because of the lack of officers in the Engineer branch. In view of all these circumstances, does not the Senator from New York think it would be better to amend his amendment by making the number, say, 700 instead of 600, so that there will be no question about it?

I understand that the General Staff or the President can either reduce or increase the various branches under the reorganization bill; but that procedure involves red tape, and it seems to me that in view of these circumstances we ought not to make such a great decrease in the Engineer branch.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the redistribution of personnel which was made necessary by the adoption of volunteer training as contrasted with universal military training was worked out as practically, and I may say as scientifically, as we could do it. It is a distribution which is not fixed, as the Senator has said. It is an allotment. The number of officers in any branch can be increased. Of course, it must be done, however, by taking that increase either from the detached officers' list or from some other branch of the service, whichever has the need for officers. We believed that the number of 600 was very close to what the Engineer Corps actually need. If they need 643 I think there will be no trouble about their getting them. All they have to do is to prove their case to the Secretary of War, who, of course, acts for the President. It does not really mean the President.

Mr. HARRISON. They would have to go through that formality, and the Secretary of War can say that the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate weighed this matter and gave great consideration to it and put the number in the Engineer Corps at 600, and that might have great weight with him. In view of the fact that the number of officers was decreased on the motion of the Senator from New York after the bill had been prepared and had been under discussion here for days, when the total number of officers was decreased from 18,000 to 17,000, I believe, in all of the branches, it seems to me that it is a little too much of a decrease to go from 900 to 600 in the Engineers alone.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, there is one other thought that I have in mind. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Lenroot] has reserved his amendment that has to do with the construction division. The Senator will renew his amendment as soon as the bill comes into the Senate. Should he be successful in his effort to strike out the separate construction division, he will then offer an amendment, as I understand it, to place the construction work, with the exception of the utilities, under the Engineer Corps. That, ordinarily, would require an addition to the Engineer officers. The number of officers that the Engineer Corps have said they would require if they were given the construction work is 130. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Wisconsin in the hope that in the event his amendment should succeed—and I hope it will not—we would not have to indulge in redistribution and reallocation of the personnel under this bill, but would rather rely upon the elastic features and the detached officers' list.

We now have under this bill approximately 1,100 officers available on the detached list. The bill says that the maximum on the detached list shall be 1,500; but our allotments here, and the needs of the service as prescribed in the bill, actually reduce that number to 1,100 available officers. Now, we might from that number of 1,100 available officers use some of those detached officers to reinforce the Engineer Corps. It can be done by the War Department itself. I do not know what the intention of the Senator from Wisconsin is as to whether, in the event that he succeeds in striking out the separate construc-

tion division and putting the construction under the Engineers, he then intends to offer another amendment increasing the number of Engineer officers.

Mr. LENROOT. I will say to the Senator that I do intend to do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You see, then, that adds 130. I have grave doubt that we ought to go any further. That would make it 730.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the chances are that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin may not prevail, even though I hope it will prevail.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If it does not prevail, I for one have no objection to making it—

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest making it 650. They say they require 643.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Give them 650, then.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to see that particular branch suffer, because it is doing an important work. As I understand the Senator, then, if the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin should be defeated, he will not oppose an amendment to the bill making it 650?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would accept that amendment under that set of circumstances.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, of course, if my amendment should be successful, it would require a larger number than that—650 plus 130.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is where I begin to have my doubts.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, if he is correct, they require 643 now, and if I shall be successful in my amendment they will require 130 more, because the separate construction division provides for 200.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One hundred and fifty.

Mr. LENROOT. One hundred and fifty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed—

Mr. HARRISON. Has the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Lenroot] reserved his amendment for a separate vote in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has given notice that he will reoffer it in the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is in the Senate and still open to amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. I now move to strike out section 37 of the bill.

Mr. KIRBY. Does that relate to the separate construction division?

Mr. LENROOT. It does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin moves to strike out section 37 of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall say only a word regarding this amendment. It is the same proposition which was defeated in the Committee of the Whole by one vote. I propose to strike out the provision for a separate construction division, and if the amendment shall be successful I shall follow it up with an amendment placing all new construction the estimated cost of which exceeds \$25,000 under the Engineer Corps, and another amendment placing the operation and maintenance of these utilities in the Quartermaster Corps. I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made before, I vote "nay."

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Simmons], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Fall]. I have been given to understand that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote on this amendment. I vote "nay."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette], who is absent on account of illness. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. King] and vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Gay]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Kenyon] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. He is not present, and I am therefore not at liberty to vote.

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, is absent. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I make the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 33, not voting 45, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Dial	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smoot
Gerry	Kirby	Overman	Trammell
Gronna	Lenroot	Pomerene	Underwood
Harris	McKellar	Ransdell	
Harrison	McNary	Smith, S. C.	

NAYS—33.

Ashurst	Henderson	Myers	Sutherland
Brandegge	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Swanson
Calder	Kendrick	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Keyes	Phipps	Wadsworth
Curtis	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
France	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.	
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Spencer	
Hale	Moses	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—45.

Ball	Fletcher	McLean	Simmons
Beckham	Gay	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Glass	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Capper	Gore	Norris	Stanley
Colt	Harding	Owen	Townsend
Comer	Hitchcock	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Pheasant	Watson
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindexter	Williams
Edge	Kellogg	Reed	Wolcott
Elkins	Kenyon	Robinson	
Fall	King	Sherman	
Fernald	La Follette	Shields	

So Mr. LENROOT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. In view of the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] a few moments ago when the bill was in the Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the amendment on page 20, lines 5 and 6, by which the number of officers in the Engineer Corps was reduced from 900 to 600, be reconsidered, and that the bill be amended on page 20, line 6, by striking out before the word "officers" the words "nine hundred" and inserting the words "six hundred and fifty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the number of officers in the Engineer Corps was reduced shall be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 20, line 6, before the word "officers" strike out the words "nine hundred" and insert the words "six hundred and fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as there seems to be no further amendment to be offered, I ask unanimous consent to take up House bill 12775, which is the House Army reorganization bill, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move to amend House bill 12775 by striking out everything after the enacting clause and substituting the perfected text of Senate bill 3792 as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

Mr. REED. There was a little confusion in the Chamber, and I could not hear what the proposition was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has moved to strike out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 12775, now before the Senate for consideration, and insert in lieu thereof the perfected text of Senate bill 3792, the bill which has been under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. REED. Would that cut off all further amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not cut off any amendment by way of perfecting the text of either one of the bills, but if the Senate is going to vote upon the question now it will have to vote upon the bill as perfected in the Senate as a substitute for the House bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire very much to see the size of this Army of 300,000 reduced to not more than 200,000 troops. I had intended offering an amendment to that effect, but I never want to do anything that is utterly useless or attempt to do a thing utterly impossible of accomplishment. Taking into consideration the votes which have already been cast upon kindred propositions, and which unmistakably manifest the set purpose of the Senate, I am certain that an amendment such as I have authored would be overwhelmingly defeated. The spirit of militarism seems to possess the Senate. Accordingly all I can do is to register my protest against a bill which will burden the country unnecessarily, and this at a time when the country is carrying a load so enormous that the people are staggering beneath it.

I realize that it is useless to offer such an amendment, and I shall not offer it, but I am going to venture the prediction that it will not be very many months before it will be discovered that the sentiment of the country is against this step toward Prussianization.

A standing Army of 300,000 men in the United States, 250,000 men in the Navy, and a National Guard, which the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] insists can thrive and prosper under this bill, is a Military Establishment larger than we need and larger than can be justified by any kind of logic or by the citation of any reason. The Army is three times that of any Army we have ever had in a time of peace.

There never has been a period—in recent years, at least—when we were in so little need of a great Army as now. As the country has grown I am willing to see an increase proportionate to the growth of the country, but an Army in excess of 200,000 men at this time can not be justified.

I repeat what I have said before, Whom are we going to fight? If it is Mexico, we do not need a standing Army of 300,000 for that purpose. It certainly is not Germany or Austria; they are helpless. It is not our allies in the late war, I hope. But this Army is nevertheless to be fastened upon us. All I can do is to utter my protest. I shall utter it elsewhere. I think the whole of the country is returning to a normal condition. I think the country in that respect is far in advance of the Congress, particularly of the Senate. I believe an appeal to the people will demonstrate the accuracy of my expressed judgment.

Bear in mind that this Army is to cost, man for man, probably three times what any army has heretofore cost; that the pay has been increased; that the cost of subsistence has been increased; and that the burden will be grievously felt. The new Army—not including the Navy—will cost \$600,000,000 per annum. That is a fixed charge, to go on year after year. It is three times the cost of the German army in time of peace. It is a tax of \$6 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is a tax of \$30 per year on the head of a family of five persons.

I warn the Senate that we will not always have "Flush times in Alabama," by which I, of course, mean flush times in the United States. There is every probability that there will be a default, temporary or permanent, in many of our foreign loans. Indeed, a temporary default is a certainty; it has already occurred. The taxpayers of America must go into their pockets and keep up the interest on our bonds, the proceeds of which we loaned to foreign countries, now in default. We have shoveled out American dollars to foreign countries since the armistice to the tune of nearly two thousand millions of dollars, and I believe the major part of it has gone to absolutely bankrupt countries. Pay day is coming, and the only way to get ready for pay day is to cut down our expenses and, if possible, keep up our income.

The idea that the United States can endure anything, any amount of bloodletting, is one of many errors into which our egotism too often has led us. A single poor crop in the United States and we will confront a condition that will be very hard to meet. This Government can not afford to default in the interest on our obligations, even though the proceeds thereof went to other countries that have defaulted to this Government. We must reduce expenses, and one of the safest places in the world to reduce is by a reasonable reduction in the size of our standing Army.

Why is it that we are even thinking about an army of 300,000 men? Let me answer my own question. It is because the military spirit seized the executive department of the Government, because they sent down a bill here demanding 576,000 Regular soldiers. I suppose that the Committee on Military Affairs thought they were doing very well when they pared that down to 300,000. But no such bill should have been sent here in the first place.

Of course, if you leave it to the officers of the Army they will say exactly what they have always said, that they want "a large and efficient Army." I do not blame the officer of the Army; he looks at it from his own peculiar standpoint. He was born somewhere on a farm or in some village or city, and at the age of 16 or 17 was sent down to West Point and put in a military strait-jacket and taught the art of fighting, and he has done mighty well at it. I am not here to reflect for a single instant upon him, but he lives that life and he looks at all conditions from the standpoint and through the atmosphere of the professional soldier. If you let him have his way we will have an Army of a million men. But the Congress ought to take a view that embraces the whole country and all of its interests.

I have never been a pacifist; I have never been in favor of national disarmament. I think disarmament as taught by some is the idlest dream that ever filled the brain of man. If you disarmed the white race to-morrow the yellow race would control the world the day after to-morrow. The thing that has made possible white civilization has been the ability of the white man to defend himself against all comers, and he could only do that because he had arms in his hands superior to those possessed by barbarians. I am perfectly willing to agree to a limitation of armament, but to talk about disarmament is an idle thing. I say that so that my other remarks will not be misunderstood.

Striking a balance between the foolishness of disarmament and the extreme view of a great army, I am unable to find any necessity or justification for 300,000 professional soldiers in a time of profound peace in this country. It would be a good deal better if the most of them were engaged in useful occupations, helping to produce and to fill the gap that is now existing between production and consumption. That gap is, after all, the chief reason for the high cost of living. If you make 10 per cent more shoes than the people of the country need to wear, the price of shoes will come down. If you have 10 per cent less shoes than the people need to wear, the price of shoes will go up. That is true of every other thing we use. The gap between production and consumption was caused by the withdrawal of a vast number of men from the avocations of peace and the productive occupations and putting them upon the field of battle where, of course, they had to go, and where they did magnificent work; but the loss of their labor and their products is nevertheless upon us.

I have asked the question, Why this Army? I have asked it a half dozen times on the floor of the Senate, and I have received nothing but the silence of a cynical smile from Senators who are proponents of the bill. I have inquired whether we are creating this Army because of imaginary internal troubles. One Senator made an argument of that kind, but I think he afterwards recanted it, or explained it away.

We have some strikes, and we will have some. We have some lockouts, and we will have some. There has not been a strike yet requiring any such body of troops as this, and I surely think some means can be devised by which the strike as a perma-

nent institution in our country can be abolished and an equitable way provided for the settlement of disputes between labor and capital.

I am not in favor of creating this sort of an army because there may be some possible strikes. I am not in favor of doing so upon the theory that the American people are disloyal. They are not disloyal. Let any community in the United States be convinced that it has a really disloyal man in its midst and it will run him out or hang him before the posse comitatus can get there to protect him. Lurid headlines in the papers about some slight disturbance, picturing it as though it were a war, help to keep the public mind excited over dangers that are largely of the imagination. I ask Senators—I ask the people of the country—to examine the conditions of the communities where they live, where they know the people. Inquire whether they are law-abiding, loyal, or disloyal. Speaking of my own State, I could find a horse thief a good deal easier than I could an anarchist or a traitor, and we have not any superabundance of horse thieves; besides we have some associations that would attend to them if the officers were to prove inefficient.

We ought to get the blood out of our heads. We should know that the war is over and that America is out of it. Some of you ought to realize that you can not put her back into it. Try to pass a bill to raise an army to send over to Russia now! Try to pass a bill to raise an army to send over to Japan or China on account of Japan's seizure of Shantung; try to pass a bill to send our Army over to make war on Italy over Fiume or any other question; try to pass a bill to send another American soldier across the water; approach the question from that angle, and see how far you will get. If you vote for it, go back home and see what your people have to say about it. The American people will not tolerate it.

Another thing they will not tolerate is the use by armies of moneys appropriated to feed starving women and children.

Mr. President, I have entered my protest. I am powerless to change the existing situation. I say that an army of more than 200,000 men in this country at this time is a crime against the taxpayers; that it is unnecessary; and that it ought not to be imposed upon the American people.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, just a moment before the final vote is taken and the bill is passed. The highest amount, according to the records that I have been able to find, that was ever paid out by any nation in time of peace for its army was paid out by Germany in the year preceding the late World War, and the highest amount that Germany ever paid for its army up until 1913 was \$200,000,000. The provisions of the pending bill can not be enforced at an expense of less than \$600,000,000. Senators are going to make this bill the law, and they are going to tax the American people at least \$600,000,000 for a peace-time military organization. The burden is going to be on those of you who vote for it. I do not propose to do so.

In addition to that, you are fixing the power and control of the Army in the hands of a military caste in this country, which, in my humble judgment, ought not to be done. We ought to have a democratic army in this country, and not a militaristic régime patterned after Germany. We have defeated the German army with the young men of this country; and yet after they won the war we are by this bill deliberately turning our backs on our own military traditions and institutions of the past and accepting the German military system that has brought nothing but ruin to Germany, and which came very near bringing ruin to the world.

Remember, Senators, that when you pass this bill you are voting for an army three times as expensive as any nation ever had in time of peace. I protest against its passage. I believe the bill is un-American; I believe it is unfair to the American people at this time to tax them in any such way. I do not think the bill ought to pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator from Missouri desire the yeas and nays on the substitution or on the final passage of the bill?

Mr. REED. I desire the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The pending question is on the substitution of the Senate bill for the House bill.

Mr. REED. I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 42 of the bill by striking out the last two words on line 8 and all of lines 9 to 11, inclusive, and all of line 12, page 50, to and including the word "major," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That from among such persons there shall be appointed not less than 12 colonels, 150 lieutenant colonels, and 750 majors, such appointments to be made upon the recommendation of the chief of the arm, branch, service, bureau, or department in which the officer has served or is serving, and the concurrence of the board of general officers herein provided. No such person below the age of 48 years shall be appointed to the grade of colonel or below the age of 42 years to the grade of lieutenant colonel, or below the age of 32 years to the grade of major.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the committee will be willing to accept the amendment and let the matter go to conference. I had not anticipated discussing the question at any length, but I will say that the main purpose of the amendment is to allow the appointment of emergency officers, those outside of the Regular Army, to the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major, and to give emergency officers, or those on the list of emergency officers, fair representation in these appointments. That is the main purpose of the amendment. It has one further object, and that is to reduce slightly the age so that persons of 32 years of age may hold the position of major. I had occasion to comment on that aspect of the matter a few days ago, and referred to the fact that great wrong would be done certain majors, especially in the Judge Advocate General's Department, by fixing the age at 34 years, as proposed by the bill. This amendment fixes definitely the number of these officers as determined by Congress, and it is not left absolutely to the determination or recommendation of officers of the Regular Army and as they may be influenced by personal relationship or feeling.

I think it a most meritorious amendment. It simply gives to those outside of the Regular Army, and who have ably served their country, the recognition to which they are justly entitled. I trust at least that the amendment may be accepted by the chairman of the committee and may go to conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I ask the question for information, because I do not apprehend quite clearly the purpose or the effect of the Senator's amendment. As I understand, the Senator suggests that this amendment is to take care of an emergency and to permit, automatically, the transfer to the Regular Army, or, at least, to invest with the powers of Army officers a large number of persons who are now upon the reserve list.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I so understand. They are upon the reserve list and not a part of the Regular Establishment.

Mr. KING. The emergency which the Senator has in mind obviously must be a war or the enlargement of the Army.

Mr. STERLING. No; the Senator is under a misapprehension. These are termed "emergency men or emergency officers." That, I think, is a general term given those who do not belong to the Regular Army or the Regular Establishment, who served in the war, who enlisted voluntarily, or who were conscripted and brought into the service in that way, and the idea is that they may have recognition and a fair chance for promotion with the men of the Regular force.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, just a word upon this amendment. I shall not delay the Senate.

Let me say for the information of the Senator from Utah that the bill provides that half of all the vacancies created in the commissioned personnel of the Regular Army by the terms of this bill must be filled by the appointment of men who have been officers in the recent war—that is, emergency or citizen officers in the recent war—and a certain series of age limitations is placed upon those men in the several grades. Under the terms of the bill no man who is below the age of 34 can be appointed a major in the Regular Army from civil life or from among these emergency officers. While we provide that half of all the officers that are to be appointed in the Regular Army must be these veteran citizen officers, we do not attempt to say how many of them shall be colonels, or how many lieutenant colonels, or how many majors. The amendment of the

Senator from South Dakota makes it mandatory upon the President to appoint at least 12 of them as colonels, 150 of them as lieutenant colonels, and 750 of them as majors, whether they are fit for it or not.

Mr. STERLING. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It says "not less."

Mr. STERLING. I do not think any question can arise as to the fitness of the men that may be selected and that will be recommended for appointment to these various places, nor do I think the Senator from New York believes that any question will arise as to their fitness. They will be recommended, of course, by the chief of their particular branch of the service, which recommendation must be concurred in by a board of competent general officers, as provided by the amendment itself, Mr. President.

I think in all fairness that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the amendment reads that not less than this number must be appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REED and Mr. McKELLAR called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made before, I vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], but I am informed that he would vote with the committee on this bill, so I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Not knowing how he would vote on this bill, I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY]. If present, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. NORRIS's name was called). The junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is unavoidably absent from the city. If he were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS. Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I transfer the general pair I have with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Ashurst	Henderson	McNary	Smoot
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Kellogg	New	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Nugent	Sutherland
Comer	Keyes	Page	Thomas
Curtis	King	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	Kirby	Phipps	Wadsworth
Erelinghuysen	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Lenroot	Pomerene	Warren
Glass	Lodge	Ransdell	Wolcott
Hale	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.	
Harris	McCumber	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—10.

Dial	McKellar	Sheppard	Trammell
Gronna	Overman	Simmons	
Harrison	Reed	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—40.

Ball	Fernald	Kenyon	Robinson
Beckham	Fletcher	La Follette	Sherman
Borah	France	McLean	Shields
Capper	Gay	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Gore	Nelson	Stanley
Culberson	Harding	Newberry	Swanson
Cummins	Hitchcock	Norris	Townsend
Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Watson
Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	Poindexter	Williams

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the United States Army, to establish military justice, and for other purposes."

Mr. FRANCE subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement. I was delayed in reaching the Senate from my office in time to vote upon the passage of the Army reorganization bill. If I had been able to reach here in time, I would have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives upon the bill and amendment, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. NEW, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. THOMAS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 12775, as reported from the committee to-day, be printed, showing the bill as amended and passed by the Senate. My information from the printing clerk of the Senate is that such a procedure will save one print of the bill, which is important in view of the scarcity of paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that Senate bill 3792 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that immediately after the river and harbor appropriation bill has been disposed of I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the Fuller pension bill. In case the river and harbor bill should not be disposed of to-day I shall ask the Senate to-morrow, after the close of the routine morning business, to take up the Fuller pension bill for consideration.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 11892, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand, the Senate has passed through the bill and the procedure now will be to begin at the first amendment passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over will be found on page 1, line 3, where the Senate committee pro-

poses to strike out "\$12,000,000" as the sum appropriated and to insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, would the Senator object if we should take up another amendment or two at this time? I think the amendment just stated by the Secretary will bring about quite a good deal of discussion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to passing over that amendment temporarily, with the idea that when we dispose of the other amendments we will take it up again.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment as a new section. I think it will be section 6.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator that under the unanimous-consent agreement with which we began the consideration of the bill the Senator can not offer that amendment until all the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. HARRISON. That was the idea I had in suggesting that the first committee amendment be laid aside temporarily—that these individual amendments might be passed on and then we might return to that one.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the committee amendments are to be disposed of first.

Mr. HARRISON. I have no objection to taking up the first committee amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] offered an amendment to raise the amount proposed by the committee. Is that amendment pending, or does the Senator desire to present it?

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to say something about that amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that the Senator offer his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well; I offer the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 1, line 3, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24,000,000."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, \$24,000,000 is the amount recommended by the Board of Engineers as necessary to do the river and harbor work for the coming year. The first estimate submitted by the Board of Engineers was, I think, approximately \$43,000,000, but after consultation with the House committee, and I think with the Senate Committee on Commerce, at their request to cut down their estimates to the lowest point to which they could be cut and yet provide enough for the prosecution of work on the rivers and harbors during the coming year, they brought in the last estimate for \$24,000,000. I notice in the report filed by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], it is stated:

Your committee hoped that it might feel justified in approving the amount as it came from the House.

In the House the amount of \$12,000,000 was carried for this work for the coming year. The report proceeds:

We are in hearty accord with the desire to meet the need for economy. The Engineers were told to go over the revised list of projects very carefully with a view to giving us the very lowest sum that they could get along with without detriment to existing commercial needs. They went over the projects carefully and insisted that \$24,000,000 (\$5,000,000 for maintenance and \$19,000,000 for improvement) was the lowest sum they felt they could get along with.

Notwithstanding that last report, with all the economy that it was possible to conceive of upon the part of the Board of Engineers to carry on the work for the coming year, namely, \$24,000,000, the Senate Commerce Committee cut it still further to \$20,000,000. Necessarily, in view of the suggestion of the Board of Army Engineers, each project will be hampered to a more or less extent by an inadequate appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] does not desire to have this amendment voted on until he is here, and he expects to be here to-morrow. Therefore, since I suppose the Senator would prefer to have the discussion of the amendment at the time it is to be acted upon, I suggest that we take up the other committee amendments which have been passed over, and then I will ask unanimous consent to vacate our former order, so that the Senator from Mississippi will have an opportunity then to offer the amendment he desires to offer, and any other Senator can offer any amendment he wishes.

Mr. HARRISON. That is thoroughly agreeable to me, and I shall say nothing further on this particular amendment until it comes up to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought the Senator would prefer to make his argument on the same day the amendment is acted upon. I ask that the first amendment of the committee may be passed over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I also ask that the amendment on page 2 may be passed over, because that is to be considered in connection with the one just passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will also be passed over. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 7, where the committee proposes to insert the following item relative to the Mississippi River, La., in the following words:

Mississippi River, La., with a view to securing an outlet to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico by the most practicable route for a permanent channel of a depth not exceeding 35 feet, and in investigating this matter consideration shall be given to the question of utilizing the Industrial Canal, New Orleans.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] proposes to amend the amendment beginning on line 21, after the words "35 feet," by striking out the comma and the words "and in investigating this matter consideration shall be given to the question of utilizing the Industrial Canal, New Orleans."

Mr. RANDELL. Does the Senator from Utah wish to say anything on that now, or will he permit me to make a statement first, as I was not present when the matter came up before?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may proceed now.

Mr. RANDELL. This amendment, Mr. President and Senators, was inserted by the committee at my request, and it provides for a most important service. I doubt if Senators realize how important the measure is which is provided for by the amendment.

I was talking the other day with Gen. Beach, Chief of Engineers, and he told me that he did not believe there was any engineering project on earth comparable in importance with the plans for deep water at the mouth of the Mississippi River. That mighty stream drains nearly two-thirds of this Republic. All the water falling between the Alleghenies and the Rockies must pass to the Gulf through the Mississippi River, which is well called the Nation's sewer. It is thought by geologists that in comparatively recent times the delta lands of the Mississippi River were formed by the gradual filling in of sediment on both banks and that a great gulf extended up the valley above the present site of the city of Cairo, Ill. Beyond question the Mississippi River in its onward march to the sea carries in solution a very large quantity of earth and sand. It is constantly making additions to our continent, constantly extending the land into the Gulf of Mexico. I have not a map before me, but anyone who will look at a map of the United States will find a narrow strip or neck of land on both banks of the lower Mississippi River extending far out into the Gulf. That is caused by the deposit of sediment when the onrushing waters of the river, going down with considerable flow, strike the placid, quiet waters of the Gulf. As soon as the current ceases to move the sand and sediment settle to the bottom. Vast quantities of it are deposited, especially during times of high water, such as there is in the river now.

The papers in the last two days have published accounts of two breaks in the Mississippi River levees—one near Fort Jackson, only a few miles above its mouth, and the other at the little city of Bayou Sara, in the upper part of my State. Neither one is very disastrous, but they indicate that the great stream is not in peaceful mood; that it is rushing down rapidly with its colossal volume of water, accumulated from 31 States, carrying a giant load to the ocean. It is making land at this moment and making it rapidly.

Many years ago the engineers attempted to secure a proper channel from the city of New Orleans to the Gulf. New Orleans is to-day easily the second city on the continent in foreign trade, and its commercial importance is of the highest rank. In the volume and value of its imports and exports it is exceeded only by the city of New York. There is a rapidly growing commerce from New Orleans to the whole world. As our relation with the West Indies and Central and South America grow more and more intimate, and trade with the Orient through the Panama Canal assumes great proportions, the importance of New Orleans is much enhanced. A number of shipping lines have recently been established from the city to various lands.

The great engineer, James B. Eads, about 40 years ago suggested a plan to give a depth of 30 feet of water across the shallow bar at the mouth of the Mississippi River by contracting the channel between artificial dikes made of willow mats and stone, reducing it to a width of about 600 feet on the sur-

face and 300 feet on the bottom. He was allowed to experiment only with the South Pass of the river, which carried about one-tenth of the volume of the water. His efforts were successful, and in pursuance of his plans a channel depth of 30 feet has since been maintained.

But there has been a constant expense, and fear that this narrow channel might some day be blocked by a ship sinking in the midst of it. It is only 600 feet wide at the surface, Senators; it is only 300 feet wide on the bottom. It is about 30 feet deep. One ship, and not a big one at that, sinking in South Pass, would completely block the commerce of the second port in America.

With that possible calamity constantly before us, the foresighted people of the Mississippi Valley some 20 years ago appealed to Congress to give them another channel to the sea, and a project was adopted providing for 35 feet through Southwest Pass, which carried, if I recollect correctly, about seven-tenths of the volume of the river. The engineers have been working faithfully on this Southwest Pass Channel for 15 or 16 years and have never yet gotten it anything like the depth of South Pass. They hope to get it that depth and deeper. They expect by drawing the banks closer together along the same general plans pursued by Eads to secure a depth of 35 feet. In the meantime the land is constantly building out on both sides into the Gulf, and no one can predict with reasonable certainty what the result will be.

In view of that fact, in view, too, of the further fact that the Atchafalaya River practically takes its source in the Mississippi 250 miles above its mouth and seeks an outlet in the Gulf for the waters of Red River and a large portion of the Mississippi by a route 150 miles nearer to tide level than by going down the Mississippi, the problem is uncertain and serious. The Mississippi may seek a new channel to the sea through the Atchafalaya, leaving New Orleans an interior town, as the Yellow River of China did several centuries ago when during a great flood it made an outlet to the sea 500 miles from its former mouth. There was and perhaps still is real danger of the Mississippi doing likewise. It was checked years ago by placing in the river several sills, composed of willow mattresses, stretching across the Atchafalaya at its head, thereby checking the flow of water from the Mississippi and preventing a great volume from going out.

It is a wonderful engineering problem, worrying us all the time. We never know what is going to happen to the river.

So that with all these things in view, Mr. President and Senators, the people of the valley, again looking to the future, decided to ask Congress to have the engineers make comprehensive surveys for another outlet, if one be possible, from the vicinity of the city of New Orleans to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico.

That is what is contemplated by my amendment. I have not the slightest objection to the change which the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] seeks to make in it. As a matter of fact, it would be more comprehensive with his amendment. What the people of the valley wish is to arm the engineers with the authority to make a comprehensive investigation on both sides of the river in the vicinity of New Orleans, so that if it be feasible to start out on the west bank and go to the Gulf via Barataria Bayou or from the Lake Pontchartrain end of the Industrial Canal, as indicated in my amendment, they can do so. All facts can be secured and reported to Congress.

The Senator from Utah is mistaken, however, in suggesting that it ever entered my mind or the minds of the people of New Orleans to have Congress purchase or pay for the Industrial Canal. We are spending \$20,000,000 of our own money to improve the interior harbor of the city of New Orleans and make of the canal a splendid basin where ships can anchor alongside great manufactories and commercial houses—something that will furnish us vast additional harbor facilities—purely a local commercial proposition but one of the greatest magnitude and importance. The only reason for referring to the canal in my amendment was to let the engineers know that, if it be feasible, Congress would like for them to see if an outlet to deep water in the Gulf may not be secured from the Lake Pontchartrain end of the canal; and of course I expected every other practical outlet to be examined and reported upon.

I make this explanation simply that the Senate may understand what the Commerce Committee had in mind in adopting my amendment. I wish it distinctly understood that I am not opposing the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Utah; I consent to it, but want the Senate to know that if it should remain as it was reported the people of that section have no idea, certainly not at this time—I do not know what they may wish to do in the future, but certainly no idea at this time—of asking any appropriation for the purchase of the canal.

They would be very happy if the engineers could find an additional outlet to the sea from the great seaport of New Orleans. It would please them immensely if an outlet to the sea could be found where there is not a constant volume of sand pouring in and filling up again and again any channel that is dug, and that is what happens to-day. We want a sure and safe outlet, if possible, for our marvelous commerce, but we have not the faintest idea of abandoning the present project. The business of New Orleans is too important to the Republic and the world to be jeopardized by any contingency, and we must be foresighted enough to guard against all possibilities.

Since we started work on the southwest pass of the Mississippi River the 35-foot project for Boston Harbor was adopted and carried to completion, and the 35-foot project for Baltimore was adopted and completed. I am not complaining that Congress has not made liberal appropriations for the mouth of the Mississippi, but merely state a fact in saying that the money which has been appropriated has not yet secured the desired results, and we do not know that those results can be secured by present methods. I say it is wise to have another outlet if it be possible to secure one within reasonable cost, and that is all my amendment provides.

I am entirely willing to agree to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Before my colleague proceeds, I would like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall be glad if I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. I am not familiar with the subject which has been discussed, neither do I understand the relation of the Industrial Canal of New Orleans, which is referred to in the amendment, to the contemplated plan of improvement or development suggested by the Senator. I would like to ask the Senator what is the relation of the Industrial Canal to his proposed permanent channel of a depth not exceeding 35 feet, and further, if there is a possibility of the utilization of the Industrial Canal, why has not the State utilized and improved it so as to afford another outlet, instead of limiting the outlet for commercial purposes to one channel, which I understand the Senator to say now exists?

Mr. RANSDELL. In answer to the Senator I should like to point to him on the map which he has here the site of the Industrial Canal. It begins on the Mississippi River in the limits of the city of New Orleans and runs about 6 miles across the city and through its outskirts to Lake Pontchartrain. It is a big canal, constructed by the city under the engineering auspices of Gen. George W. Goethals, who is, I believe, considered the best canal expert on earth. Connecting it with the river is a very large lock and dam, so that boats and ships coming out of the river cross from the river into the canal and then into the waters of Lake Pontchartrain. So much for that part of the answer.

The proposition now is to secure, if possible, an outlet to the Gulf from the vicinity of New Orleans, either through that canal, which, if the Senator will follow the pencil, he will see would lead through Lake Pontchartrain and possibly down through Lake Borgne, or what we know as the Rigolets, over to Mississippi Sound, and then into the Gulf of Mexico, and on to the east by a very much shorter route than to follow down the Mississippi River to its mouth. It would be a very great saving in distance. The waters through Lake Pontchartrain, Lake Borgne, and the upper part of Mississippi Sound are very shallow. I am not at all sure that we can get a feasible 35-foot channel through there.

The Senator will notice that my amendment provides for securing the most practicable route for a permanent channel of a depth not exceeding 35 feet from the Mississippi River, La., out to the Gulf of Mexico. I do not say where it shall start. I simply say:

And in investigating this matter, consideration shall be given to the question of utilizing the Industrial Canal.

If the engineers should find that the Industrial Canal is the best and most feasible route from the Mississippi to the Gulf, there surely could be no objection to its being used. I will show the Senator where it is possible that another canal might be constructed. It is on the west bank of the river down from Lake Salvador and Barrataria Bayou and Barrataria Bay past Grand Isle at a point designated on the map here [indicating]. That would be a very much shorter distance from the Gulf than by way of the Mississippi proper; but when you reached the Gulf you would be considerably west of the mouth of the Mississippi. You would then be obliged to go south for some distance and go around the

neck of land formed by this constant building of a new continent, which I have described, and then on to the eastward. It is one or the other of these routes which we contemplate.

Now, in further answer to the Senator's question I will say that the State of Louisiana, as one of our American Commonwealths, surely is not especially concerned with this outlet to the sea for the entire Mississippi Valley. It is concerned with its own industrial enterprises. It has built this canal at a cost of between \$18,000,000 and \$20,000,000 in order to increase its harbor facilities, but it is not asking one cent from the Federal Government. If a better route can be found to the Gulf, it wants the better route. I think I have answered the question.

Mr. KING. Fully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot].

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Louisiana is willing to accept the amendment which I have offered, perhaps it would be useless to take any time in discussing the question further, but I shall do so just for a moment or two by way of explanation.

I have failed to learn of a single canal in the United States a survey of which has been ordered by Congress for which in the end an appropriation for its purchase was not made. I have a number of times noticed in connection with items directing that a survey should be made of a canal owned by individuals or by corporations that at the time the survey was authorized those who were instrumental in having the provision for the survey inserted in the river and harbor bill have assured us beyond the shadow of a doubt that it carried no appropriation nor none would be asked, unless it should prove to be of great importance to the commerce of the United States, and yet there have been a number of unprofitable propositions put over on the Government as the result of such legislation. So I am always suspicious when an item for the survey of a particular canal is asked for.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. RANSDELL. I was merely going to ask the Senator from Utah if he would mind naming some of those canals?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will wait until I reach that point I shall do so.

Mr. RANSDELL. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. I have thought that if we were going to have a survey "with a view to securing an outlet into deep water in the Gulf of Mexico by the most practicable route for a permanent channel of a depth not exceeding 35 feet"—and that is as far as the provision ought to go—then the engineers would make a survey of the whole situation.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will assure the Senator from Utah that was the intention I had.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think very much of an engineer who would make a survey and not consider the Industrial Canal at New Orleans. It may be that that would be the cheapest route; it may be it is the only feasible route; or the engineers may be able to find a half dozen better routes; but why by legislation direct the engineers to consider the question of utilizing the Industrial Canal at New Orleans?

I take it, Mr. President, the effect of such a provision would be that the engineer assigned to make the survey would take it for granted that Congress was interested in his making a favorable report upon that canal because it is specifically mentioned. I take it for granted that what the Senator from Louisiana says is true, that the people of New Orleans will be perfectly satisfied with a survey; and if there were commerce enough to justify a 35-foot canal between the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico, for one I would support not only the survey but an appropriation for its purchase. I am in favor not only of developing and maintaining harbors, but also, the carrying out of projects upon rivers wherever the commerce to be benefited will justify the outlay.

So far as the Mississippi River is concerned, I think that unless some plan of improvement can be devised by engineers other than those known to-day it would be cheaper for the United States to build a double-track railroad on both sides of the Mississippi River, from St. Louis to New Orleans, maintain such roads, and haul the freight for a tenth of what it costs to-day than for the Government to put that river into condition whereby a profitable commerce can be developed upon it. From the standpoint of an investment, if it is finally decided that the Government of the United States is to improve the Mississippi River to that end, and maintain it, as no doubt it will do if the project is undertaken, I think the best thing in the world

for us to consider now is which is the cheaper thing to do—build railroads, maintain them, and carry the freight at a nominal figure, or go to the extent of spending the millions and tens of millions and, no doubt, the hundreds of millions of dollars which will be necessary in order to put the Mississippi River in condition whereby the great vessels of the country can go up and down it and carry the commerce of the country as I should like to see it carried.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. RANDELL. Suppose the suggestion of the Senator were adopted and we were to build a great double-track railway on each bank of the Mississippi River, making, I presume, four tracks in all, from the northern portion of the United States to the southern portion. Where would the Senator have the southern terminus of those railroads? How would he get the commerce from the southern terminus into ships?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I take it for granted that that can be done very easily. I think there is plenty of room for the building of any kind of terminals that are necessary for the transfer of commerce.

Mr. RANDELL. Would New Orleans suit the Senator as the southern terminus?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not care where it would be located; I would want it located at the best possible place for the commerce of the South.

Mr. RANDELL. I will say to the Senator that there are six or eight railroads already running into New Orleans as their southern terminus, and they carry an immense commerce down there. We are not now considering any question except how to get that commerce from the terminus to the ocean. That is the point, and that is the only purpose of the proposed survey, namely, to get to deep water.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware of that; I understand the effect of the proposition now pending before the Senate; but I was speaking upon the broader question of river and harbor improvements.

Mr. RANDELL. I will meet the Senator on that point when we come to it; but I was trying to confine myself to the particular question under consideration at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sorry that I have intruded upon the time of the Senate or of the Senator.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator has not intruded.

Mr. SMOOT. If that was all I had in view, I would have accepted the Senator's proposition and simply allowed the amendment to have been agreed to and let it pass. I expect to speak upon the bill at some length before it is finally passed, and I was just thinking aloud, as it were—

Mr. RANDELL. I do not want to interrupt the Senator at all.

Mr. SMOOT. As to what it would cost the Government of the United States if the Government should undertake to do what the Senator would like it to do.

Mr. RANDELL. I am not asking that it do anything now except to give us this survey.

Mr. SMOOT. No; not now. I am aware of that; but there is not a Senator here and there is no one else in the United States who does not know that the Senator from Louisiana would not destroy quite the credit of the United States; but I want to say that he would go a long way to stretch the credit of the United States by appropriations to be spent upon the Mississippi River. Of course, the Senator is interested in that subject, greatly so, and perhaps rightly so, but it becomes the duty of every Senator, in my opinion, first to consider the amount of the appropriation to be made and then what is to come by way of return from the expenditure of the money. I am not now going into that question any further. As I have said to the Senator, I was merely thinking aloud.

I have traveled on the Mississippi River and I have watched the development of that river and tried to arrive at some conclusion in my own mind as to what the duty of the Government of the United States was toward making that mighty highway a great avenue of commerce. I am rather in sympathy with the expenditure of money if such a result can be accomplished, but so far I have not seen any result from the improvements made upon the Mississippi notwithstanding the amount of money we have spent. If the Senator from Louisiana or any engineer in the United States can arrive at some solution of that great problem and can demonstrate beyond a question of doubt that the ultimate result will be success I shall be for that proposition; but in our river and harbor bills, Mr. President, we appropriate a little money this year, a little money next year, and we pull

out a few snags in this creek and a few roots and trees in another one, and by the time the subsequent river and harbor appropriation bill is under consideration it becomes necessary to make the same appropriations over again, and no practical result comes from the expenditure of the money.

I am going to undertake at this time to say that this whole policy is going to be changed at some time or other. So far as I am concerned, whenever there is a project undertaken by the Government of the United States and it can be shown that it will develop the commerce of the country and be of advantage to the people, I want then the appropriations made for it and to have it completed as quickly as possible.

The everlasting dragging out of appropriations upon projects which the Government has made up its mind to complete is a wicked waste of public money, and I say that no business man on earth would follow the example set by the Government in this regard.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. SMOOT. I will.

Mr. RANDELL. I agree with the Senator that we have pursued a very wickedly wasteful policy in regard to improving a great many of our rivers. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we started to improve the Ohio River in 1876, so as to get 6 feet of water, and in 1910 we changed the project so as to get 9 feet. We have carried it along in the most unbusinesslike way; but whose fault is it? It is the fault of men who, like the Senator from Utah, oppose every river and harbor bill; oppose it so strenuously that it is absolutely impossible to secure proper appropriations.

Now, I wish to ask the Senator this question: Will he join the Commerce Committee and Senators who favor the businesslike improvement in putting the Ohio River—I am referring now to one concrete proposition, to one great river, where there is an immense commerce—under a continuing contract, so that it can be finished within the next five years?

I wish to say to the Senator that if the project is carried forward, as it has been carried forward in the past and as it is being carried forward now, it will not be finished within the next 10 or 15 years. Now, will the Senator join us in putting it on a continuing contract basis and finishing it just as we completed the Panama Canal?

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator I wish to say I do not want to appropriate another dollar of money for any kind of a project that will cost for the carrying of commerce over it an amount per ton or per hundred pounds that never can be justified. The Senator speaks of the Ohio River. I called the attention of the Senate once before to the estimated cost to the Government for furnishing waterways to float the actual commerce on a few of the projects mentioned in the bill which was pending at the time I made these remarks. Among them is the Ohio River, on which the cost is a little over \$5 a ton, excluding soft coal, when you take into consideration the interest upon the money and the amount of money expended.

On the upper Mississippi River the cost was \$12 a ton.

On the lower Mississippi, \$35 a ton.

On the Arkansas, \$20 a ton.

On the Hennepin, \$36.75 a ton.

On the Missouri, a little over \$40 a ton.

Muscle Shoals, \$41 a ton.

Aransas Pass Canal, \$80 a ton.

The Brazos, \$80 a ton.

The Red River, \$100 a ton.

The proposed Muscle Shoals project, \$100 a ton.

The Big Sandy, Ky., \$350 a ton.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how many of those rivers were finished, how many of them were in condition to carry commerce? The Ohio every summer, as the Senator knows, shallows down to not over 2 or 3 feet. You can wade it at the city of Cincinnati. We ought to have finished it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the wicked thing about the whole proposition. You can wade these streams a part of the year, and part of the year they are dry, and we are trying to make rivers of creeks and call them navigable streams.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator would not call the Ohio River a creek, I hope.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that the Ohio is of that description. We all know that it is not, but I am calling attention to the facts as they exist to-day; and I will say further to the Senate of the United States that if that can be avoided by making appropriations to complete the river, and if it can be demonstrated that it will be to the interest of the commerce of the United States I would want to appropriate money for it, and do it as quickly as possible.

Mr. RANDELL. A great engineering commission, composed of five of the ablest men in this country, investigated the Ohio River project, looked into the question of its cost, and said that it could be improved at a cost of about \$63,000,000, and that when improved it would carry an immense commerce at a rate a very little higher than that at which the commerce on the Great Lakes is carried, which is about one-tenth the average railroad freight rate. It could be carried on the Ohio River in just the same way.

The Ohio River is in the center of the greatest commerce-producing section in this country. There is nothing comparable to the Pittsburgh section and the section 50 miles around there, and much of that commerce would go to the sea in boats if we had a completed channel. Of course, it can not go in boats now any more than a railroad with a gap of 50 or 100 miles could carry commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am perfectly aware that this Ohio River project is not a success to-day. There are few projects that the Government of the United States has started of late years that will be.

I do not know that I ought to take any more of the time of the Senate to-night. If my amendment is agreed to, as I think it will be, I have no objection to the amended amendment.

Mr. RANDELL. I will say that I have accepted the Senator's amendment, as far as that goes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think myself that the authorization for this survey has more merit in it than a good many other surveys in this bill.

Mr. RANDELL. I am glad the Senator feels that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will pardon me, I should like to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Does the chairman of the committee propose to go on with this bill this evening?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are just one or two other amendments of the committee which I think will only take a minute or two, and there are one or two Senators who have amendments that they would like to offer that I think will take but very little time. I should like to dispose of those to-night. I will say to the Senator that I do not expect to have the amendment relating to the amount passed on to-night.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am unwilling that this bill shall be considered in the absence of the Senate. We have had two very interesting speeches here this afternoon—very illuminating to those who heard the speeches. They were not illuminating to the rest of the Senate, of course; and there are now by actual count in the Senate Chamber 9 Senators, or, counting the Presiding Officer, 10.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I made the inquiry because I do not want anything further done to-night unless we have a quorum.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator will not object to the amendment that I have offered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to get through with the committee amendments first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the committee amendments are to be first considered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the next committee amendment is known as section 6, on page 16, and I am going to withdraw that amendment for the reason that I think the proposition is fully covered by existing law. It is the purpose of that amendment to authorize the Secretary of War to prescribe areas within which oil, acid, and so forth, can not be deposited. Section 13 of the river and harbor act of 1890 reads as follows:

That it shall not be lawful to throw, discharge, or deposit, or cause, suffer, or procure to be thrown, discharged, or deposited, either from or out of any ship, barge, or other floating craft of any kind, or from the shore, wharf, manufacturing establishment, or mill of any kind, any refuse matter of any kind or description whatever other than that flowing from streets and sewers and passing therefrom in a liquid state into any navigable water of the United States or into any tributary of any navigable water from which the same shall float or be washed into such navigable water.

It seems to me that that language is just about as broad as language can be toward preventing the deposit of refuse matter, oil, and so forth, from ships in navigable waters; and I think

that enables them, so far as it can be enforced, to protect the waters of a harbor against the deposit of oils, and so forth, from ships.

That is all of that provision of the section. There is a semicolon there, and then it begins as follows:

And it shall not be lawful to deposit, or cause, suffer, or procure to be deposited, material of any kind in any place on the bank of any navigable water or on the bank of any tributary of any navigable water where the same shall be liable to be washed into such navigable water either by ordinary or high tides or by storms or floods or otherwise whereby navigation shall or may be impeded or obstructed.

The department informs me that their officers construe the last clause there—

Whereby navigation shall or may be impeded or obstructed—

To affect both parts of that act. I do not think there is any justification at all for any such construction as that. The language of the act to the first semicolon is clear and definite and certain, and beginning after the semicolon it is an entirely new prohibition, and I think the last clause refers only to the last part of the section.

For that reason, therefore—namely, that I think the subject matter is fully covered, even much more broadly covered than by the language of the section that is proposed by the department—I ask that that amendment may be rejected. I will say that they advise me that no court has passed upon the proposition or construed it, but it is simply construed by some of the officers of the department, so I ask that that amendment may be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Now, Mr. President, in regard to section 10 of the bill, if the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] desires to make a point of order, I shall ask that that may go over and be disposed of to-morrow with the other amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I shall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That leaves three committee amendments undisposed of. There are two or three Senators here who have some amendments they would like to propose, and on which I think there will be no discussion. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the rule that we adopted requiring committee amendments to be disposed of first be vacated just for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right, Mr. President; but before granting consent I want to ask the Senator if he has examined the amendments that are going to be presented, and if he is willing to accept them?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is an amendment that was adopted once before in the Senate. I can not say that I am willing to accept it. I am willing to have the Senate pass upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. I would not want the Senate to pass upon it with the number of Senators that are here to-night, and I think we had better adjourn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not seen the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. I do not know what it is.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator has forgotten it. I submitted it to the Senator from Utah. I should like to have it read, and I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Probably, when I hear it read, I will remember it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

Brunswick Harbor, Ga.: The Secretary of War is hereby directed to report to the next session of Congress whether or not the project adopted by the act of March 2, 1919, provides sufficient depths to enable the deepest-draft ships of all regular lines using this port to reach their docks or the sea, when fully laden, without being delayed by the necessity of awaiting high water or using two tides to enter or leave the harbor; and, if adequate depths are not provided by the existing project, whether sufficient depths would be provided by the larger of the two projects reported by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 393, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I will state that additional steamship lines have been established at Brunswick in the past few years, and this is simply to have the engineers ascertain which of the two projects reported on by the Army Engineers is necessary to enable the vessels, when heavily laden, to reach the docks.

Brunswick Harbor is conceded by all familiar with it to be one of the best on the Atlantic coast. Brunswick has more than doubled in its inhabitants in the past four years, and is one of the thriving cities of Georgia, with a brilliant future.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The amendment does not commit Congress to any proposition, but simply furnishes us information?

Mr. HARRIS. That is all there is to it.

Mr. SMOOT. With a view of committing Congress later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 20, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Father Soul, life giving, life sustaining Potentate, direct our thoughts, control our ways, that we may be willing instruments in Thy hands for the furtherance of good.

We thank Thee that out of the terrible war through which we have just passed Thou hast inspired us to greater life and nobler activities, especially in economy and brotherly love.

Through common sense and reason we are defeating greed and profiteering by living the simple life, and we pray that out of the unrest and unreasonable demands a wholesome lesson may come to all. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the legislative, judicial, and executive appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13677) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I desire to see if we can agree on a time for general debate and a division of that time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose, because of the amount carried in the bill and the questions that may come up in explanation of the bill, it will take a half or three-quarters of an hour, and I have requests for an equal amount of time. It seems to me that we would require an hour and a half on this side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We can get along on this side with less time if the gentleman cares to do so. Any time less than that will be agreeable to us.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman agree to an hour and a half on this side and one hour on that side?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; if the gentleman is going to take an hour and a half, we will take an hour and a half on this side, but we are willing to take one hour on each side. If the gentleman can not do that, we will agree to an hour and a half on a side.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the other half by myself.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is it the intention of the chairman to pass this bill to-day?

Mr. GOOD. I would like to pass it to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman propose to confine the general debate to the bill?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] wants to make a speech on some historical matter. But as I understand there is to be no political discussion on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The doorkeepers will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 293, nays 4, answered "present" 1, not voting 129, as follows:

YEAS—293.

Anderson	Ferris	Lea, Calif.	Robison, Ky.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Romjue
Anthony	Focht	Leibach	Rouse
Ashbrook	Fordney	Leshner	Rowe
Aswell	Foster	Linthicum	Rubey
Ayres	Frear	Little	Rucker
Bakka	French	Loneragan	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Fuller, Ill.	Luce	Sanders, La.
Barbour	Gallivan	Luhning	Sanders, N. Y.
Barkley	Gandy	McAndrews	Sanford
Bee	Garland	McArthur	Scott
Begg	Garner	McClintic	Sherwood
Benham	Garrett	McCulloch	Siegel
Benson	Glynn	McDuffie	Sims
Bland, Ind.	Good	McGlennon	Sinnott
Bland, Mo.	Goodall	McKenzie	Slomp
Bland, Va.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Blanton	Goodykoontz	McKinry	Smith, Ill.
Boles	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Bowers	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snell
Box	Greene, Mass.	MacCrate	Steensson
Briggs	Greene, Vt.	MacGregor	Stephens, Miss.
Britten	Griest	Magee	Stephens, Ohio
Brooks, Ill.	Griffin	Maher	Stevenson
Brooks, Pa.	Hadley	Major	Stiness
Buchanan	Hardy, Colo.	Mann, S. C.	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hardy, Tex.	Mansfield	Summers, Wash.
Burroughs	Harrison	Mapes	Summers, Tex.
Butler	Hastings	Martin	Sweet
Byrnes, S. C.	Hawley	Mason	Swope
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hayden	Mays	Taylor, Ark.
Caldwell	Hays	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Kans.	Hernandez	Merritt	Thompson
Candler	Hersey	Michener	Tillman
Cannon	Hersman	Miller	Tilson
Carss	Hickey	Milligan	Timberlake
Carter	Hoch	Minahan, N. J.	Tincher
Casey	Hoey	Monahan, Wis.	Tinkham
Christopherson	Holland	Mondell	Towner
Clark, Fla.	Houghton	Montague	Treadway
Clark, Mo.	Howard	Moon	Upshaw
Classon	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ohio	Vaile
Cleary	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Venable
Coady	Humphreys	Morgan	Vestal
Cole	Husted	Mott	Vinson
Connally	Hutchinson	Mudd	Volgt
Cooper	Ireland	Murphy	Volstead
Copley	Jacoway	Nelson, Mo.	Walsh
Crago	James	Ogden	Walters
Crisp	Jeffers	Oldfield	Wason
Crowther	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Watkins
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Olney	Watson
Dale	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Weaver
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Overstreet	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Johnston, N. Y.	Padgett	Welling
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Park	Whaley
Dent	Juul	Parker	Wheeler
Dickinson, Mo.	Kahn	Parrish	White, Kans.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Peters	White, Me.
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Platt	Wilson, Ill.
Dowell	Kettner	Pou	Wilson, La.
Dunbar	Kless	Purnell	Wingo
Dunn	Kincheloe	Quin	Wise
Dupré	King	Rainey, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kinkaid	Rainey, J. W.	Woods, Va.
Eagan	Klecza	Raker	Woodyard
Elliott	Knutson	Randall, Calif.	Wright
Elston	Kraus	Randall, Wis.	Yates
Emerson	Lampert	Reavis	Young, N. Dak.
Esch	Langley	Reber	Young, Tex.
Evans, Mont.	Langham	Reed, W. Va.	Zibelman
Evans, Nebr.	Lankford	Rhodes	
Evans, Nev.	Larsen	Ricketts	
Fairfield	Lazaro	Robinson, N. C.	

NAYS—4.

Huddleston Keller Sinclair Thomas

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Rodenberg

NOT VOTING—129.

Ackerman	Drane	Kreider	Riordan
Almon	Eagle	Layton	Rogers
Andrews, Md.	Echols	Longworth	Rose
Baer	Edmonds	Lufkin	Rowan
Bankhead	Ellsworth	McFadden	Sabath
Bell	Fess	McKinley	Schall
Black	Fisher	McLane	Scully
Blackmon	Flood	McPherson	Sears
Booher	Freeman	Madden	Sells
Brand	Fuller, Mass.	Mann, Ill.	Shreve
Brinson	Gallagher	Mooney	Sisson
Browne	Ganly	Moore, Ind.	Small
Brumbaugh	Gard	Morin	Smith, N. Y.
Burke	Godwin, N. C.	Neely	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Goldfogle	Nelson, Wis.	Snyder
Cantrill	Gould	Newton, Minn.	Steagall
Caraway	Graham, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Stedman
Carew	Hamill	Nicholls, S. C.	Steele
Chindblom	Hamilton	Nichols, Mich.	Stoll
Collier	Harrell	Nolan	Strong, Pa.
Costello	Haugen	O'Connell	Sullivan
Cramton	Heflin	O'Connor	Tague
Currie, Mich.	Hicks	Paige	Taylor, Tenn.
Curry, Calif.	Hill	Pell	Temple
Darrow	Hudspeth	Phelan	Vare
Davey	Hulings	Porter	Ward
Dempsey	Igoe	Radcliffe	Welty
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Rainey, Ala.	Williams
Dewalt	Kelly, Pa.	Ramsey	Wilson, Pa.
Dominick	Kendall	Ramsey	Winslow
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Rayburn	
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, N. Y.	
Doughton	Kitchin	Riddick	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. DEWALT.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. DRANE.
 Mr. WARD with Mr. GALLAGHER.
 Mr. SHREVE with Mr. CARAWAY.
 Mr. DENISON with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. STEAGALL.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota with Mr. DOMINICK.
 Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. BOOHER.
 Mr. HICKS with Mr. GARD.
 Mr. LAYTON with Mr. HEFLIN.
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. STOLL.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. PELL.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. BRAND.
 Mr. CHINDBLOM with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
 Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. IOGOE.
 Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. HILL with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. PAIGE with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. SISSON.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. PHELAN.
 Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. STEDMAN.
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. FISHER.
 Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. COLLIER.
 Mr. FESS with Mr. O'CONNOR.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. BLACK.
 Mr. HARRELD with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. BRINSON.
 Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. HUDSPETH.
 Mr. ROGERS with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. BROWNE with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. RAYBURN.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. DARROW with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. BAER with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. WELTY.
 Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. REED of New York with Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina.

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL, voted?

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. RODENBERG. Then I withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

The name of Mr. RODENBERG was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13677, the railroad deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. HUSTED in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I desire to speak briefly but frankly upon the subject of paying a cash bonus to the soldiers of the late war. An erroneous impression prevails throughout the country, and even upon the floor of this House, with regard to the appropriations that have been made during this Congress for the soldiers of that war.

One frequently hears that we are doing little or nothing for the soldiers of this war. Nothing could be further from the actual facts. What I shall say upon this subject should not be construed as a lack of appreciation upon my part of the splendid and heroic service performed by the more than 2,000,000 American soldiers whom we sent to the other side to fight our battles; nor do I want anything that I shall say construed as a lack of appreciation of the heroic sacrifice made by all of the 4,800,000 men who were enlisted in the Army and Navy during that war. America can never pay its debt of gratitude to the brave boys who performed that heroic service. [Applause.] Their place in history is secure. We can not add to or detract from the glory of their achievements. What I desire to call to the attention of the House to-day is the fact that at present we are confronted with a condition and not a theory. On the 30th day of last June there was a deficit in the Treasury of the United States of about \$3,634,000,000. That deficit was evidenced by short-time United States Treasury certificates. Economical as we have tried to be, without appropriations for bonuses to the soldiers, there will be a deficit in the Treasury on the 30th of June next of approximately \$4,000,000,000. I am not unmindful of the demand for bonus legislation for our soldiers. America has always been mindful of the splendid service of her soldiers. She has taken better care of her soldiers than any other country in all the world. She has paid them as high, if not higher, pay when they were in the service than any of the countries of Europe, and with one exception, that of Australia, higher pay than any other country in all the world has paid its soldiers, and I am glad to have played a part in securing the increase in their pay.

During the Civil War there were engaged on the Union side a total of 2,800,000 men.

The second year after the close of that war, a period corresponding to the time we now occupy with regard to the close of this war, we paid out for all purposes in pensions and hospital treatment and in administration \$21,000,000 for the soldiers of that war. In the twenty-fourth year after that war was over we paid out \$92,000,000 during the year in pensions, hospital treatment, and the administration of soldier legislation. Last year, the first time we had reached the mark of more than \$200,000,000, our total appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1919, for the soldiers and sailors exclusive of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, including administration, was \$223,000,000. That is the history of the magnificent way in which America has taken care of her soldiers and sailors. With the same sympathies and generous treatment will she care for the soldiers of the war with Germany.

What have we done with respect to the soldiers of the late war?

Is it true that we are unmindful of the sacrifices of the brave men who fought the war in 1917? Is it true that we have done nothing for them? No; very far from it. We carry in this bill \$7,666,000 for hospital treatment for these soldiers for the re-

maining three months of this year. We will have paid out by the 30th of June, 1920, for the soldiers of this war, for the 12 months' period, \$263,968,993. That excludes all payments for the soldiers of the Spanish-American War, all payments for soldiers of the Civil War, and is confined to the soldiers and sailors of the war of 1917 alone. That is \$40,000,000 more than the high-water mark reached more than 50 years after the close of the Civil War in the payment of pensions and hospital treatment of the soldiers and sailors of that war. But that is not all. We have placed on the statute books of the United States laws that will call for more money as the years go by. What are the estimates of the various departments for the relief of the soldiers of the war of 1917 for the next year? I shall put into the RECORD the details of the expenditures so that he who runs may read the magnificent treatment provided in legislation already enacted for the soldiers of this war.

The Government will expend for the year ending June 30, 1920, on account of the soldiers and sailors of the recent war for compensation for death and disability, hospital treatment, appliances, care of the insane, and miscellaneous items, \$135,000,000; for the allowances to the families of men in the military and naval services, \$48,000,000; for administrative expenses of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, \$15,852,806; for vocational training and rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors by the Federal Board for Vocational Education, \$38,000,000; for the construction of hospital buildings for the Public Health Service, \$9,950,000; and for the care of patients in hospitals, \$17,166,187, making a total of all items of \$263,968,993. The estimated or requested expenditures for the next fiscal year, which will end June 30, 1921, are as follows: For compensation for death and disability, hospital treatment, appliances, care of the insane, and miscellaneous items, \$197,865,600; for administrative expenses of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, \$10,324,400; for regional offices and for expenses of advertising for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance under legislation pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, \$1,250,000; for vocational training and rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors by the Federal Board for Vocational Education, \$125,000,000; for the care and maintenance of patients in hospitals of the Public Health Service, \$40,000,000; and for the construction of additional hospitals and hospital facilities under a request for legislation pending in the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, \$84,000,000, making a total of all items for the next year of \$458,440,000.

The details of the payments for this fiscal year and the estimates of expenditures for the soldiers and sailors of the war of 1917 next year are as follows:

	Fiscal year 1920. Appropriations in all acts and pending deficiencies.	Fiscal year 1921. Appropriations in pending bills or estimates of appropriations or authorizations for appropriations.
Bureau of War Risk Insurance:		
Compensation for death and disability, hospital care, appliances, etc.	\$135,000,000	\$197,865,600
Military and naval family allowances	48,000,000	
Regional offices, advertising (Wason bill)		1,250,000
Administrative expenses of the bureau	15,852,806	10,324,400
Federal Board for Vocational Education, vocational training	38,000,000	125,000,000
Public Health Service:		
Hospital construction	9,950,000	84,000,000
Care and maintenance of patients in hospitals	17,166,187	40,000,000
Total	263,968,993	458,440,000

¹ Requests for legislation pending, respectively, in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

My friends, these figures speak for themselves. Is it a record for which we need to apologize? You and I are receiving letters from the people we represent on the subject of granting a bonus. Personally I have received one or two letters only in favor of a bonus, but many against it. Most of the demands I receive are for relief from other burdens. Men and women everywhere are asking that the taxes be reduced. They are asking that the appropriations be reduced. They recognize that a reduction in appropriations must precede a reduction in taxation, that a reduction in taxation must precede a reduction in the cost of living. The Committee on Appropriations during the past week has been working night, day, and Sundays trying to pare down a bill so that it will meet with the sentiment of the people you represent. The estimate for sundry civil expenses, aggregating

over a billion and thirty-six million dollars, is being pared so that it will hurt, and that committee hopes to report that bill cutting out between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000 of estimates of appropriations. [Applause.] You applauded; but, gentlemen, I want to say it is folly to pare appropriations to the bone because we do not have the money and then turn around and make appropriations of \$1,000,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000 not estimated for. I fail to see constructive economy in such a course.

I have a few letters here from ex-service men with regard to what the bonus legislation will mean. These boys are splendid fellows, for no country had a better soldiery than the United States in the war. In fact, we think no country had soldiers that compared with the soldiers of the United States in that war. [Applause.] Now, what is the argument in favor of the bonus? We say that during the war men remained at home and received good salaries while these boys went to war and made great sacrifices. That is true. Some of those who remained behind were made millionaires; others have the stamp upon them of profiteers; and now, to equalize that condition, it is proposed that we should take out of an empty Treasury money to pay a bonus to those who went to war. My friends, the greatest badge that the American soldier will ever wear will be the badge of sacrifice, and not the badge of a bonus. [Applause.] I am not sure but we do him an injustice even if we had the money to place him along with the men who received unjust and unfair profits out of war contracts, so far as financial consideration is concerned. I would send the profiteer to jail; I would place the other on a pinnacle of glory because of his wonderful sacrifice and service from which no Congress now or in the future could ever remove him. [Applause.]

About 500,000 colored men entered the war, and they made good soldiers. And you gentlemen representing the Southern States, from which they largely went, are complaining and your constituents are complaining now because of a lack of men in your cotton fields and your factories. You are complaining now because of a lack of employment. You are complaining now because men are not taking up the regular avocations of life and there is an underproduction. I ask you in all seriousness what effect the payment of such a bonus will have on your cotton and other production? What will you say when you turn over the \$500 to every one of these soldiers who served in that war and witness the withdrawal of this class of labor, so sorely needed, from active participation in the productive walks of life? Are we to act blindly now and after the damage is done consider the results of ill-advised legislation? Let us seriously consider first and act afterwards. We must consider that a great many of the boys who engaged in that war were mere boys from the fields and factories, from the schools and the colleges. They had not yet formed habits of thrift and industry. They had not yet learned in the stern school of experience that work is the only true manhood, the only true nobility. Turn over to young boys who have not yet established these well-grounded principles of life and its activities the sum of \$500 and a great many of them will not work until that money is expended. Would their parents turn over such a sum to them? Should we take from the pockets of an overtaxed people one or two billion dollars and distribute it in many cases among young, inexperienced boys whose parents would not sanction such an act? Our factories demand more men every day. Will the bonus aid in stimulating production? No. We will have a lot of boys who will not work until the bonus is gone, not because they are bad boys but because their habits of life have not yet been fixed and firmly established. And when the bonus is spent some of these boys will be worse off than before. Here is a letter that I received from the county chairman of the American Legion in a county in my district. He says:

The bulk of a cash bonus would immediately go back into circulation by its investment in automobiles, clothes, jewelry, and other luxuries, and a portion of this bulk not thus invested would very soon find its way back into circulation due to the principal being used as funds to provide a long vacation.

When the scarcity of labor is so acute and that of competent and efficient help is more so, it seems that we should not encourage further the utter lack of initiative and desire to better conditions for themselves that is so prevalent to-day by paying this class a compensation which will only make them the more independent.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. In referring to the 500,000 colored troops the gentleman meant that that number went from both the northern and southern sections of the country—

Mr. GOOD. I meant all told.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. And not from the South alone, but the whole country.

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that the total of the colored troops was 500,000.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I know we did not send that many from the South.

Mr. GOOD. Now, the gentleman has brought up another question. A few months ago we had trouble in America by race riots. I want to ask the gentleman, and I will ask him to answer it in his own time—

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The gentleman is mistaken, I did not intend—

Mr. GOOD. I want to say we have in cities like Washington, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, and these large centers a mixed population. Are you not afraid when you do what is contemplated that you will simply add to the problem of race disturbances and riots in these large centers? [Applause.] We must talk frankly upon this question, because what is under consideration is fraught with such terrible consequences that we must realize now what the probable result of our act may be. The things I am saying now are things I do not like to say, but they are things that you and I have got to think about and talk about if we would act as we should act. We have got to stand up and be counted now when there is so much unrest and when America is looking to the Congress of the United States to steady the ship. We must be sure that our action is wise and constructive and not destructive. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I want to say that I am in hearty accord with what the gentleman is saying, and I did not rise a moment ago to criticize at all.

Mr. GOOD. I am sure the gentleman is. Now, I have another letter from the adjutant of the American Legion in another county in my district, in which he states:

Some time ago the local legion post, of which I am at present adjutant, took up the question of a bonus, or rather adjusted compensation, and it was decided at that time that it was not practicable for the Federal Government to attempt to pass a bonus bill and that whatever adjusted compensation might be asked should come from the State rather than the Federal Government.

In the past few days I have taken the matter up with a number of the members of the local legion and others who were in the World War, and you will undoubtedly hear from them in the near future.

There is no question in my mind but what it would be a foolish move to make such a drain on the Treasury as would be necessary to successfully carry out the bonus bill.

I am not permitted to give the names of the writers of these letters, but if any Member wishes to see these letters they are open to him. They are from splendid, patriotic boys, who might not object to the publicity, and these letters indicate how some of the ex-service men are thinking.

Now, another thing. Prices are high, they are burdensome; people are complaining because of high prices. The Committee on Appropriations, when estimates were presented to them for an investigation that would bring down prices, while believing that little could be done in that direction by investigation, in practically all cases, where any plan was offered that even intimated that a decrease in the price of necessities might result, reported out the appropriations. Especially is this so with regard to the office of the Attorney General. The committee wanted to uphold his hands in trying to bring down the high prices of the necessities of life, and especially when those prices had been increased by profiteers.

There is going over the country now a propaganda for people to quit buying, except the things that are actually necessary. I believe that policy ought to be followed and practiced by everybody. It appeals to our good judgment. [Applause.] We ought to economize. We ought not to buy a thing that is not absolutely necessary at these high prices. We ought to try to bring about a condition so that the 105,000,000 of men, women, and children who did not go to the World War, as well as the 4,800,000 who were called, can live under a more normal condition and enjoy some of the benefits of life. If you appropriate \$1,000,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000, how are you going to raise it? Some one says by consumption tax, but there is objection to that on the part of some one, and that person says, "Oh, no; let us not lay the tax on the poor; let us put a tax on corporations and on the rich." Unless I have misjudged the temper and have misunderstood the statements of the men who came before the Committee on Appropriations asking for appropriations to reduce the high cost of living, their contention without exception was that the taxes levied to carry on the war and pay the obligations of the war, taxes that were laid largely on the corporations and men of large incomes, are, in the main, passed on to the ultimate consumer. That is the claim of the Federal Trade Commission and other executive departments. You say that you do not want to put a tax on consumption, because that will be paid by all, but the departments that have investigated it say that it does not make any difference where you put it, in the main it is paid by the man who eats food and wears clothes. [Applause.] Do you really want to bring down the high cost of

living? If we do, we will say to the ex-service men, who have performed a wonderful service, that their bravery and devotion and self-sacrifice will ever be held in grateful remembrance by all our people, that that service is above price, and that to commercialize it will degrade. To raise such huge sums now will cause hardship out of all proportion to the benefits that will be derived, and will do more to decrease production than any legislation we can possibly pass. By the same determination and sacrifice by which the American soldier was a contributing factor in the winning of the war can he now assist in placing the standard of the American soldier a little higher than it was ever placed before. [Applause.]

The danger from foes from without has passed. Is the danger from the spirit of unrest from within behind us? We are passing through a time when every man and every woman and child in America must sacrifice. We are face to face with an abnormal condition. If you and I vote one billion or two billion dollars, I do not care how you raise it, that money is going to be spent in the markets of the United States. By that expenditure and in that amount you are going to increase the cost of living to every man, woman, and child in the United States. [Applause.] And those of you who think you are catering to a demand of 4,800,000 men will, before you know it, face the wrath of 100,000,000 Americans who are compelled to pay higher prices because of your act. Because America will not stand for this. One thing that is creating unrest in America to-day, the one thing that is causing the spread of bolshevism and all sorts of kindred "isms," is the fact that the cost of living is too high. I want to see it reduced, and I seriously question the wisdom of the proposed action, for it can only result in decreasing production and increasing prices of the necessities of life.

I am going to do all that I can to try to bring down the cost of living, and I am going to say to the American soldier who was in this war, "I am willing by my vote to appropriate every dollar necessary to heal the sick, to give him the best hospital treatment available in the world, to take those who are wounded or who suffer from disease and bring healing to them, and place them in the vocational schools and make them useful citizens of the Republic. I am willing to appropriate the \$20,000,000 or more asked for to bring back the bodies of those 80,000 of our brave boys who died and are buried on the other side, but let us leave to the action of the several States the question of providing a bonus for their soldiers. The States have sources of taxation we do not have. All the States would not act at once, and hence the evil resulting would not be so critical." [Applause.]

This has been in my mind for some time. I have felt I should say it. It seems to me that we must meet this proposition in a brave and fearless way, not in a partisan way, and I think when you meet it that way and by your determination shall have brought down the cost of living to 110,000,000 of Americans, you will find more contentment, you will find property more secure, and find human life better protected than will be possible by this large appropriation which is proposed.

As was said by Horace Greeley in his great work, "The American Conflict," of the soldiers of the Civil War, so let us all say of the soldiers of this war:

Thus rapidly, as well as peacefully and joyously, were the mightiest hosts ever called to the field by a republic restored to the tranquil paths of industry and thrift, melting back by regiments into quiet citizenship, with nothing to distinguish them from others but the proud consciousness of having served and saved their country.

[Applause.]

I shall put in the RECORD a statement showing that this year we are appropriating \$263,000,000 for these soldiers, and that next year, including \$84,000,000 for building new hospitals, there is an estimate of \$458,000,000 for the soldiers of this war without putting another line upon the statute books of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also carries an appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the railroads, to pay the balance of the losses due to the Federal control and operation of them. On the 1st day of January, 1918, by an act of Congress the systems of transportation were turned over to the President to operate during the war as a war emergency. In pursuance of that act the President took control and operated something like 300 railroads, having an aggregate mileage of 250,000 miles, with a property value ranging somewhere between \$15,000,000,000 and \$20,000,000,000, and employing in the aggregate almost 2,000,000 men. The President, under the Director General of the Railroads, continued to operate them for a period of 26 months. By virtue of the transportation act these roads were turned back to their owners on the 1st day of March. A great deal of inquiry has been made as to the net results of Federal control and operation of the railroads. The Director General states that at the

present time there is a deficit or a loss due to the Federal control and operation of these roads of \$900,000,000 and that it will be necessary to pay out during the year about \$4,000,000 in administrative expenses in winding up the affairs, making the net loss as estimated by the Director General of Railroads \$904,000,000 for 26 months of operation. Of course, that is not all the loss that the Government will sustain by reason of the operation of the railroads. When the railroads were taken over 26 months ago, we appropriated \$500,000,000 as a revolving fund, and we have been paying interest on that amount ever since. Last June we appropriated \$750,000,000 for railroad operations, and we have been paying interest on that ever since. And then the transportation act carried \$200,000,000 to pay on this loss, and an additional sum of \$300,000,000 that would be used in making loans to the railroads in the future when certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

That \$300,000,000 also includes, according to the terms of the transportation act, a provision which requires the Interstate Commerce Commission to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury all final judgments growing out of Federal control and operation of the railroads. Mr. Sherley and Mr. Hines roughly estimated that those judgments would probably amount to \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000.

It is also to be remembered that with this appropriation the Government of the United States will hold a great many railroad securities. It will hold about \$15,000,000, or a little less, of investment in inland waterways, and it will hold approximately \$950,000,000 of an investment in railroad securities alone. Some of these securities—many of them—could not be sold now. To throw on the market railroad securities totaling over \$900,000,000 would cause such a panic in the United States that stocks would hardly be worth anything. But if the sales thereof were spread over a year I venture to say that from these investments in railroads, if sold and converted into cash before the end of the year, the loss to the Government on such sales and conversion would not fall below \$250,000,000. Of course, it is fortunate that we are not compelled to bring about such a disaster even to the security holdings of the United States or to the Government itself. It is proposed that some of these securities will be carried for a long period of time. For example, when the Director General took over the railroads he let contracts for a thousand freight cars, for a large number of locomotives, and other equipment, totaling around \$400,000,000, and Congress has appropriated and is carrying in this bill the remainder to pay for that equipment.

That equipment was allocated to the several railroads of the United States, and the railroads have now accepted their allocation, but they have not the money with which to pay for this equipment. A railroad company as a usual thing never has the money to finance its growth in equipment, but usually issues securities known as equipment trusts. In this case the Director General of Railroads sold this equipment to the railroad companies and took their notes and a mortgage on the equipment, the notes falling due in 15 annual payments with interest at 6 per cent.

If you will turn to page 83 of the hearings you will find the basis upon which Mr. Sherley, as director of finance of the railroads, expects to make settlements. It is estimated that the railroads owe the Government of the United States, outside of these equipment securities, \$765,000,000; that the Government owes the railroads on compensation approximately \$490,000,000, which the Director General and the director of finance feel that they can apply as an offset to this large debt that the railroads owe to the United States, so that after applying the offset there will still be due to the Government of the United States from the various railroads in the United States in the aggregate approximately \$270,000,000. That is in addition to the allocated equipment.

Now, during the war there were certain roads that were very weak. The New England roads especially were not strong financially. For a number of years prior to the outbreak of the war some of those roads had engaged in all kinds of financing. They had been engaged not only in railroading but in running electric light plants and gas plants and street cars, and everything of that kind. The result was that it was necessary to make large loans to roads like the New York, New Haven & Hartford and the Boston & Maine to prevent those roads from going into the hands of receivers.

I do not believe that anyone who has studied the situation carefully will ever criticize or be successful in maintaining a constructive criticism against the Railroad Administration in stabilizing the transportation system by keeping the railroads out of the hands of receivers. It is estimated by those who have made these large loans that eventually this money will come back in the main. They do say, however, that there will be

losses on some of those investments; there will be losses on some of the equipment. What those losses will actually amount to no one will know for years and years to come. My own estimate is that if we were to settle with the railroads at the end of this fiscal year, giving them a whole year in which to pay their debts and obligations to the Government, the total loss to the Government would not fall far short of \$1,400,000,000.

In saying that I am not criticizing in the least the taking over of the railroads; I am not criticizing in the main the management of the roads. I think the Government was fortunate in having had at the head of the Railroad Administration Mr. Walker D. Hines and, during the past nine months, our former colleague, Mr. Sherley, as head of the finance division. [Applause.] They and those who have been with them have had but one purpose, and that was to give the Government of the United States an efficient transportation service, and it was realized that some of this loss—a great deal of it, perhaps—is chargeable to the war.

There is one thing, however, in respect to which I have never quite brought myself in agreement with the Railroad Administration, and that is not only because of the condition we were in during the war but also because of the condition in which we found ourselves when we turned the roads back to their original owners. The revenue act levied a tax of 3 per cent upon freight bills, 5 per cent upon express bills, and 8 per cent upon passenger traffic.

The total tax was estimated during the present year at \$234,000,000, which was intended to pay the ordinary expenses of the war.

Now, I have said that there were about 2,000,000 men engaged in operating the railroads. It is the statement of Mr. Hines that during the 26 months of Federal control there was an increase in wages—a great deal of it I think was necessary; some of it was unnecessary—an increase in wages since 1916 of 106 per cent. There was an increase in freight and passenger traffic of a little over 25 per cent. Now, it must have been evident to any man that to increase the wages of 2,000,000 men 106 per cent it would have been necessary, if this service was to pay for itself, to increase the freight and passenger traffic throughout the United States. It is the statement of Mr. Hines that if the rate of freight had been fixed in July, 1918, when the first general increase in wages was agreed to, it would take something over 14 per cent additional on all the freight in the United States. Now, my contention is—and I know that in arriving at his conclusion Mr. Hines was actuated by the same motive that I am actuated by—my contention is that the Director General, when he raised the wages, should have raised the price of the service which the railroads were performing, so that when the roads should be turned back into the hands of their original owners they would not be confronted with the condition that now confronts them, of high wages that they can not get away from and of a freight rate that they can not raise. The business thing to have done would have been to have left the bill as it passed the House, and Congress covering into the Treasury \$254,000,000 a year to carry on the Government and the war, and then an increase of freight rates so that the freight and passenger rates and express rates would bring in enough money to pay all the transportation charges, including the amount paid to the carriers.

Now, take Federal control, and this touches briefly upon the question of Government ownership of railroads. There was a great deal of contention out in my part of the country by the small roads that were not taken over, because of the big increase in wages on the roads that were taken over as to just what effect it had upon the industry. What is the argument? Because the Shipping Board increased the wages of mechanics in the shipyards, because munition plants increased the wages of mechanics all over the country, that it was necessary to increase the wages in these large centers of men engaged in transportation. A blanket order was issued to satisfy those men, and I think that was necessary, perhaps, in a way. When you raise the pay of conductors or engineers in one locality you practically have to do the same in other localities. I wanted to find out, and I took four roads in my own State, two of them under Federal control and two under private control during the war. I want to put in the Record a statement as to the results of the increase of wages. For example, the small station attendant of a road in private ownership got \$90 per month. On the roads under Federal control they were paid \$120 a month. The motorman under private control got 50 cents an hour; under Government control they got 75 cents an hour. The superintendent of substations under private control got \$165 a month, and under public control \$530 a month.

It was increases in some localities like these, roads running right along together, where the superintendent of substations on one road under private control got \$165 a month and lived

next door to a man performing a like service on a road under Government control receiving \$530 per month. If we are going to have in America in the future a system by which all of the transportation systems are to be owned and controlled by the Government, the thing that we are doing to-day—appropriating \$300,000,000 more to cover the loss of 26 months of Federal control and Government operation—will be the thing that we will have to repeat year after year, and out of the taxes of the American people there will have to be paid yearly millions of dollars to pay such discriminatory wages as I have called attention to and other matters of that kind due to Government control and operation.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield at this point for an inquiry?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman be good enough to inform us from what sources the Railroad Administration secured the bonds of the United States, of the Liberty and Victory loans referred to in the second paragraph on page 2, and to what extent they hold those bonds?

Mr. GOOD. There is a table in the hearing showing the exact amount that the Railroad Administration holds of each issue. These bonds were acquired in this way: When the Liberty loans were floated, the director general, Mr. McAdoo, arranged with the railroad employees to purchase for them the full amount of the bonds which they would subscribe for, and to carry them. Unfortunately there was some agreement with regard to the Railroad Administration taking back such bonds as the employee was not able to pay for. Unfortunately also there were more bonds subscribed for by the Railroad Administration than the railroad employees purchased. Under the Victory loan, Mr. Sherley directed all of the regional directors to cut the subscription 10 per cent, believing that subscriptions would fall that amount. Now, his estimate as to the amount that would be taken was too large, and we have a large number of them. There are, I believe, something like \$88,000,000 of Liberty bonds and Victory bonds that are owned by the Railroad Administration that were acquired in this way. The gentleman can well understand that in some cases it happened that where a person had purchased a bond with an agreement that if he could not pay for it he could turn it back to the Railroad Administration and get the par value for it, some men would throw their bonds back onto the Railroad Administration because of that understanding.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that at this time an employee of the Railroad Administration may turn back his bonds under that understanding and receive par?

Mr. GOOD. I think, if I remember the hearings correctly, that where a railroad employee had purchased his bond and paid for it and accepted delivery there is no agreement whereby he can turn it back; but if he has not paid for his bond and still owes the Railroad Administration for it, then he can turn it back if he can not pay for it, and get the money that he has already paid.

Now, the bill carries \$120,000,000 less than the estimate, and that is made up in this way: We have directed that about \$90,000,000 of these bonds held by the Railroad Administration shall be transferred to the War Finance Corporation, which is purely a governmental agency that has about \$600,000,000 of assets, including in its assets about \$130,000,000 of short-time Treasury certificates, and I think something over \$70,000,000 of loans to the railroad companies. Now, it was the opinion of the committee that these Liberty and Victory bonds held by the Railroad Administration should be turned over to the War Finance Corporation, and that the War Finance Corporation should take them over at par, so as to permit the Railroad Administration to discharge its obligations.

Then the transportation act, as I have before stated, carries a provision that all final judgments and claims that are reduced to judgment against the Railroad Administration shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the \$300,000,000 appropriation in that act for making loans, and it is estimated that at least \$30,000,000 of that appropriation will be used for that purpose.

Therefore, inasmuch as the Director General had included in his item of \$120,000,000 for lap-over expenses a sum to pay these claims, the committee felt that it would not be wise to appropriate for it in the transportation act and then appropriate for it in this act. [Applause.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt the course of the discussion, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is now more than a year since by the fortune of politics the responsibility for legislation in this House and the organization of the House shifted to the Republican side. Without reflecting in any way upon the attainments of any member of the majority, I think the House will agree with me that during the past year no man on that side of the House has developed more than has the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob]. [Applause.] When responsibility came to him he showed that he had a clear conception of the duties of the chairman of that great committee, and he has won the respect of every Member of this House by his courageous and fearless efforts to protect the Treasury of the United States, regardless of the effect upon his own political fortunes.

In the presentation of this bill he demonstrated again his wonderful energy. I know that he participated in the consideration of the fortifications bill, the most technical of all bills submitted to the House, and at the same time he has been conducting hearings on the sundry civil bill, covering all activities of the Government from Alaska to Panama. While contributing daily to the framing of these two important bills, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has conducted hearings upon this deficiency bill, and that he has mastered the intricate details of this great railroad problem is conclusively demonstrated by his clear presentation of the reasons why it is now necessary for us to make the appropriation carried in the pending bill. [Applause.]

I differ with him only as to one paragraph of his report and as to some of his comments to-day upon the administration of the railroads during the period of Government control. In the report accompanying this bill the gentleman from Iowa states that the loss to the Government by Federal control will total \$1,375,000,000. In arriving at this conclusion he states that if all securities of the railroads now held by the Government were thrown upon the market the Government would suffer a loss of \$250,000,000. Of course, this is mere speculation. It is undoubtedly true that if the Government was so lacking in business judgment that it should now throw upon the market the securities of the railroads, amounting to \$862,000,000, we would incur a loss of a considerable amount, and the Government that so recklessly threw upon the financial market this amount of railroad securities would not only cause a loss to that Government but it would seriously affect the financial market and cause serious loss to its citizens. No one has suggested, nor will any man suggest such action by the Government. The securities of the railroads now held by the Government will not be thrown upon the market at this time. Wisely, they will be held, and as conditions improve they will be realized upon, and while it is mere speculation, those most familiar with the character of the securities held by the Government see no reason why there should be any loss at all, and are confident in their belief that the loss to the Government, if any, will be negligible.

The report of the committee also charges against Government control of the railroads \$25,000,000, which it is estimated it will take to carry out the provisions of the recent transportation act, providing for the payment to the short-line railroads of the country of such amounts as they claim they are entitled to because of Federal control, even though their lines were not operated by the Government. I do not believe that it is fair to charge up against the Government operation of railroads this amount which it is alleged was lost by railroads that were never under the control of the Government. That was a gratuity on the part of the Congress and can never justifiably be charged up as a loss incident to the Government's operation of the railroads.

The fact is that the chairman of the committee does only that which many who oppose Government operation of railroads do—that is, seek to make Government operation more unpopular by exaggerating the loss during Federal control. I am fundamentally opposed to the Government's operation of the railroads, but in order to justify my position I do not find it necessary to exaggerate the loss during Federal control or criticize the administration of the railroads while they were under the control of the Government.

Every Member of Congress was responsible for the taking over of the railroads. The Congress gave to the President the power to take over the railroads, and lest we forget, let me recall the conditions existing in December, 1917. The railroad employees were notoriously underpaid. They were demanding increased wages. A nation-wide strike was threatened, to take effect as of January 1. We had floated one bond issue, and the railroads of the country found themselves unable to borrow money to finance their operations. With the continued bond issues of the Government it was clear to every business man in this country that bankruptcy faced them, when the bank-

ruptcy of the railroads meant that we could no longer successfully prosecute the war. The people of this country from one end to the other approved the action of the President in taking over the roads as of January 1, 1918.

Now, what has taken place since then? There are but two questions: First, has the Government economically and wisely administered the railroads, and, second, should the Government have increased the rates as contended by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]?

As to the management of the railroads it became popular to criticize the efficiency of the railroads during the first year of the operation by the Government. The fact is that in 1918 the railroads of the country faced conditions never before faced by the transportation systems in this country. The war made a draft on every industry taking their skilled employees, and they took them also from the railroads of the country. The munition plants under the cost plus system offered greater compensation to labor, and the railroads' skilled employees left day after day in order to better their condition in life. In 1918 the worst winter in the memory of man came to us. With efficient, skilled, and experienced employees in control of the railroads the railroads would have experienced great difficulties in operation, but with inefficient employees, with efficient men leaving every day, and with the drafting of men by the shipbuilding industry and munition plants, the conditions became chaotic in the extreme during the winter months of 1918. And yet, notwithstanding that, they transported successfully the unusually heavy increase of freight and transported more passengers than had ever been transported in a single year in the history of this country.

When we come to consider whether or not the railroads were economically managed we hear reference to the increased compensation to employees under Federal control and we never stop to think that there was not an industry in this country that was not at the same time increasing wages for employees by leaps and bounds.

What are the facts? Take the steel industry, a basic industry, the one industry in any way comparable to the transportation system of this country. You will find that while the wages of the employees of the railroads under Government administration increased about 104 to 106 per cent in 1919 over 1914, yet during the same period there was an increase of 144 per cent in the wages paid the employees of the steel industry in this country.

Take any other industry in any way fairly comparable with the transportation business of this country and you will find that there was a greater increase in wages paid to its employees than was paid to the railroad employees of the country. What could our people expect? Could we expect that the railroad employees, confronted as they daily were with offers of increased compensation in every other line of industry, would continue to work for the United States Government for less than they could earn in other industries? Manifestly it was impossible, and the best proof of it is that to-day, as the railroads are returned to private ownership, the railroads under private ownership are preparing to again increase the compensation of the railroad employees of this country. They have to do it, because, to start with, the railroad employees prior to the war were notoriously an underpaid class of employees. The original increase granted them was as a result of a commission appointed in 1918, and the increased compensation was made to date back to January 1, 1918. Since that time, from month to month, there have been adjustments of compensation which have increased the total compensation paid to the railroad employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman does not mean to state that the increase in wages to railroad employees since the Government took the roads over amounted to 104 to 106 per cent on the whole?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. The statement made by the director, which has been quoted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and which I have again quoted, is that the increased compensation of employees in 1919, as compared with 1914, represented between 104 and 106 per cent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The increases made by the Railroad Administration amount to less than 50 per cent, as compared with the wages when the roads were taken over by the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In considering the question of the management by the Railway Administration, in addition to the increased compensation paid to labor, which every man must admit was essential, the Railroad Administration had to pay an increased amount for supplies and material, for just because the railroads happened to be under the control of the Government, the industries of this country were

not going to sell their supplies and materials for less than they could sell them in the open market. When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] interrupted me, however, I was going to call attention to this fact, that to-day, as the roads return to private control, they realize that they will have to pay additional compensation to their employees, and certainly that can not be charged to any action of the Railroad Administration. I call the attention of the House to it right now. According to the press the railroads of this country will ask for a 25 per cent increase in rates. The freight revenues this past year amounted to \$4,000,000,000. That means that the railroads are asking for \$1,000,000,000 additional, to be paid by the shippers and finally by the consumers of this country. How do they figure it? They say in the first place that the Government has not been paying the railroads a sufficient rental. This Congress has in the transportation act authorized a policy of 6 per cent upon invested capital. The value of the roads will necessarily be taken from the valuation upon their books. That 6 per cent means that they will receive as rental \$1,100,000,000. The Government while in control has paid to them as rental only about \$900,000,000. So that to-day the railroads of the country claim that they have not been paid all that they ought to have been paid by the Government for rental, and want \$200,000,000 more. Yet some who say they are entitled to this at the same time charge the Railway Administration with extravagance. They claim that they need a 25 per cent increase. That will give them \$1,000,000,000 extra revenue, and when they take \$200,000,000 more for rental, which they say they are entitled to, that leaves them \$800,000,000 to cover increased operating expenses under private control. Last year under Government control the deficit was less than \$400,000,000, and if they are granted a 25 per cent increase, we are going to give them \$800,000,000 additional revenue to operate the roads when \$400,000,000 was sufficient under Government control and also give them \$200,000,000 additional rental. That is clearly the result and shows that while some railroad officials have criticized the Railroad Administration, and many people in this country have criticized it, for extravagant administration, the fact is that the railroads under private control are preparing to expend \$400,000,000 for operating expenses more than was spent by the Government last year, and claim they are entitled to \$200,000,000 additional for themselves in place of what we have paid them as rental.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman know why it is that they do not propose any increase on passenger rates but want to confine it all to freight?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not.

Mr. SIMS. I think I can give the gentleman the information. The passengers vote and have political influence, and they attend conventions. Freight rates are absorbed by the consumer, just like tariff rates, and they do not know anything about it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That brings me to the discussion of rates, because I do not intend to talk for any great length of time. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] says that the rates should have been increased by the director general. As I said originally, there are two questions—whether or not the business of the railroads was extravagantly conducted and whether or not the director general should have increased the rates. I think anyone can read the testimony before this committee of the director general, and he will become convinced that, so far as the increased operating expenses due to labor and material are concerned, it would have been absolutely impossible for the roads under private ownership to have been conducted for one cent less, and the fact that now, when they are returned to private ownership, they propose to increase the cost of their operating expenses indicates that they could not have conducted them as cheaply as did the Railroad Administration.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to give the impression that I thought the roads, on the whole or in any particular, were extravagantly operated. I think, as a general rule, they were very efficiently operated and economically operated. I wanted to commend the men who were in charge of the roads in that respect.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I did not quote the gentleman from Iowa as saying that. I quoted him only as to the rate question. I recall even now when we last had a deficiency appropriation in the House there was much criticism from some gentlemen on the Republican side of the House about another thing, and that is the increased number of employees. Of course we have an increased number of employees. This Congress was responsible for that. When the Congress enacted the Adamson law to establish the eight-hour day in this

country, it was manifest that we had to increase the number of employees, and to-day we have 200,000 more employees than we had back in 1916. But there is an interesting thing in connection with that increased number of employees.

While we have 200,000 more employees the average number of hours of work of the railroad employees per month in 1916 was 263 hours, while in 1919 it is only 226 hours. The railroad compensation is based on so much per hour. There were 5,126,000,000 hours of work by railroad employees in 1919, as against 5,189,000,000 in 1916. So notwithstanding the increase of 200,000 employees, the number of hours that the railroad employees actually worked in 1919 was less than in 1916, the difference being due to the change from a 10-hour day to an 8-hour day. The Director General made this statement when he was last before the committee, that he had not arrived at a definite conclusion as to the effect of this 8-hour day upon the total production of railroad employees, but now he says in 1919 it is shown that while the total number of employees worked for a less number of hours than in 1916, that they handled a greater amount of traffic than they did in 1916, when the number of hours worked was in excess of that which it was in 1919. The amount of freight handled was about the same, but the passenger traffic was 33 per cent greater, so that the total was in excess of 1916.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Iowa a little while ago referred to a certain increase in the pay of supervisors or superintendents, giving the increase as \$530 compared to \$165 under private operation. Is the gentleman able to give the committee any information as to the number of these isolated instances that are cited usually as generalities?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; the Director General, in response to a question of the gentleman from Iowa, said this: That he had no knowledge of the particular case. He said that, of course, there were isolated instances that could always be cited, and he afterwards put into the record the following statement:

Note by Mr. Hines: While an investigation is being conducted into the details of the salaries and wages mentioned, a report received by the Director General, Mr. Hines, from Mr. C. D. Cass, general manager of the Waterloo, Cedar Falls & Northern Railroad, the property mentioned as having been under Federal control, is to the effect that during 1919 there was no superintendent of substation on the property drawing \$530 per month, and, in fact, that there was no official or employee on the property drawing that amount, the highest salary of any officer or employee having been paid to Mr. Cass as general manager, and that salary being \$6,000 per annum. Prior to Federal control Mr. Cass received \$12,000 per annum. If possible a communication will be sent by the Director General to the chairman later concerning the details of the other wages given in the table presented by the chairman.

In referring to the standardization of wages the director general stated it was undoubtedly true in some sections of the country, where the prevailing wage scale was lower than the average, that the establishment of a standard wage for the entire country had worked a hardship, but that the result, looking at it from a broad viewpoint, had not been injurious to the country. He stated that the Railway Administration through its wage boards were able to say to the representatives of the employees, "You want a standard wage. That standard wage can not be the wage which exists in close proximity to a shipbuilding industry. Nor should it be the wage that prevails in the agricultural section of the South, where the wage is low. It should be an average wage. It resulted in securing an average which, while higher than the prevailing wage in some sections and lower in others, still makes it possible for us to show without fear of successful contradiction that the increase was not greater than the increase in wages of employees of other industries." I again refer to the steel industry. While we increased only 102 per cent over 1914, the steel industry, in order to retain its employees, had to increase 144 per cent over 1914. Reduced to units, in 1919 the cost of the Steel Corporation was \$1.5 per cent more per ton than in 1914, while in 1919 the increased cost to the railroads was only 61.2 per cent more per unit of service rendered than in 1914.

But to go back to the subject of rates. It was on that subject that I referred to the speech of the gentleman from Iowa. I recognize there is much to be said upon the question. In 1918 we made retroactive the increase of wages to the employees, making it date back to January 1. We established an increased rate for freight and passengers, which did not take effect until June 21, so that for six months the railroad paid the increased wage to the employees and received no increased revenues from passenger or freight traffic. The result was that we incurred a great deficit. But the director general states that if the increased rate could have been made retroactive, as the increased wage was, and had dated back to January 1, then for 22 out of

the 26 months of Federal control the revenues would have paid the operating expenses of the railroads of this country. We would have incurred no deficit until November, 1919, when the coal strike came and caused us to lose in November and December \$114,000,000. This was a loss no one could have anticipated and would have wrecked the railroads under private control.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I say this to the gentleman?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It would have been simply impossible to have made the freight rate retroactive.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course it would. Neither freight nor passenger rates could be made retroactive.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Another thing. When the gentleman suggests the expediency of freight rates having been made sufficiently high to take care of all liabilities outstanding, everyone will recall the difficulty that was had in reconciling the shipping interests of the country with the advance of 25 per cent in freight rates and a corresponding advance in passenger fares.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course, the gentleman is correct. When the increased wage was granted they undertook to establish an increased rate to meet these increased expenses. But this was not done until the Railway Administration had called into consultation all the traffic experts of this country; all the talent that would be available to the railroads under private control. They labored for a long time in order to establish an increased rate which would be equitably distributed over the entire country and work no hardship to any section or any industry, and yet even after the traffic experts of the railroads of the country had been called in and had assisted in framing the increased freight schedules, so many appeals were made that they have had about 35 traffic committees at work over the country removing inequalities in the rates, and they are still working at it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will yield.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I rose for the purpose of making the same point the gentleman has touched upon in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia.

The objection throughout the country was not so much that the rates had been increased, because everyone realized that rates must be increased, but the objection that arose throughout the country was in reference to the inequality, and inequities of the increase that was made throughout the country.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course, that was inevitable.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me one word in response to that observation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was in position to know that the objections were not only of the character he indicates but of the other character, and they were expressed with a great deal of vehemence and persistence.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. There is no doubt about the difficulties incident to the revision of freight rates. A man not acquainted with the complexity of the problem may think that with the stroke of a pen a freight-rate increase can be established that would do justice to all sections and all industries of this country, but as far back as October last the Director General of Railroads suggested to the executives of the railroads the necessity for preparing a schedule of rate increases for the consideration of the Interstate Commerce Commission when the roads were returned to private control, and from October, 1919, to this day the railroads, with all their experts, have been unable to frame a plan of rate increases to suggest to the Interstate Commerce Commission to govern their operation under private ownership. Gentlemen who carelessly state that with the increase in wages to employees on a given day the director general should have announced an increase in freight rates that would have made the revenues commensurate with the expenditures, either have not investigated the subject, or wish to deceive the public into believing that the Railroad Administration has been derelict in the performance of a plain duty.

Let us see the absurdity of the argument. What conditions existed in 1918? The wages of the employees had been increased as of January 1, 1918. In the fall of that year the employees, complaining of the ever-increasing cost of living, demanded a further increase, and we had to adjust the wage of certain classes from time to time. We saw that there should be some increase in revenue. What should we have done after November 11, when the armistice came?

There was great unrest in the country, uncertainty as to the future of business and hesitancy everywhere. Traffic upon the railways slumped until they had the worst three months in the

history of railroading. Should we have ordered an increase in the freight rates, based upon the lean months of January, February, and March, 1919? If we had we would have fixed the rate so high that every man in this country would to-day be complaining of the abuse of power by the Director General of Railroads. The Director General knew that it was an abnormal condition prevailing. He predicted better times for the railroads. Those better times came, and during May, June, July, August, September, and October, the business of the railroads picked up, and if an increase had been granted based upon the business of the railroads during June, July, August, September, and October of the same year, an increased freight rate of only 2 per cent would have been sufficient to take care of it, whereas, if you had gone to work and granted an increase in the early part of the year, the Lord only knows how much would have been necessary. It only goes to show that during such abnormal times it would have been exceedingly difficult to intelligently frame an increased freight schedule.

Then, the Director General had an additional reason. There is not a man who does not believe that it would have affected wage conditions. The men demanded a further increase in wages. The railroads refused to pay the further increase. They went to the President. The President urged them to wait. He said that there was an extraordinary condition prevailing; that there would likely be a reduction in the cost of living, and as it was reduced the men would be relieved.

The men waived their demands and agreed that they would not call a nation-wide strike.

We can recall the condition prevailing at that time. If in the face of telling the employees of the railroads that the high cost of living was going to be reduced and we could not increase wages because it would increase the high cost of living, we had gone ahead and increased the revenues by increasing the freight rates, that would have taken away every argument the Government ever had for trying to keep stationary the compensation of the employees. They would have said, "If you have increased the rates 20 or 30 per cent, you have got the money, and we want the increase." And there is another reason. An increase in freight rates would have been reflected not only in wage conditions but it would have been reflected in the increased cost of living, because the increase of freight rates would have offered a reason or a pretext to manufacturers of the country to increase the price of their products, and in the end the amount paid by the people of America would have been greatly in excess of anything ever paid out of the Treasury to make up these deficits.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman has not forgotten, however, that the President recommended that a commission be appointed to determine the wages, and that that determination of the commission should be certified as a basis for increase of rates?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I remember the appointment of the commission, and the railway employees then, notwithstanding their wages had not been increased over the year before, went back to work. But I will give the gentleman a conclusive reason why the director general should not have done what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] contends.

In 1919 hostilities had ceased. The President had power under the law to increase the freight rates, but hostilities had ceased. And the position of the Congress was that this power should not be exercised by the President. When we passed a deficiency bill here in the closing days of the last Congress appropriating money for the Railway Administration and sent it over to the Senate, the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate told the Director General of Railroads that any exercise of power by the President increasing the freight rates would be an arbitrary and autocratic exercise of that power, and that that deficiency appropriation would never go through the Senate unless there was tacked upon it the provision that the Interstate Commerce Commission would have the power to suspend any increase of rates that was announced by the President of the United States or by his agent, the Director General of Railroads. So the Director General of Railroads knew that the congressional policy was opposed to doing that which some gentlemen now claim he ought to have done.

And not only did the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee do that, but the Senate passed a bill placing this restriction upon the exercise of such power by the President. It came over here, and this House, in September of that year, knowing that we had had a deficit for the first four or five months of the year, proceeded to pass the bill, which provided that not only could the Interstate Commerce Commission

suspend any rate that was announced by the President or by the Director General, but, so far as intrastate rates were concerned, the State commission of every State must consent before they could become effective in that State. So that if he had wanted to increase the freight rates, under the act of Congress the director general could not have done so except by what amounted to unanimous consent.

Mr. SIMS. And the bill passed and was vetoed.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; it was vetoed. But Congress had spoken, and I pay tribute to the director general for obeying the policy of Congress, as expressed by both House and Senate, and declining to exercise a power which, had he exercised it, some Members of this House would to-day declare to have been a most autocratic abuse of power.

Mr. SIMS. But we did not have the nerve to pass it over his veto.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. As I understand it, the gentleman makes the point that if the Director General had increased the rate as indicated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] beyond the amount he did, while there might not have been a deficit, the people of the United States, in increased cost of living and in the increased cost of freight, would have had to pay many times the amount of that deficit?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Undoubtedly. And it was a loss due primarily to war conditions. In the one case by a freight rate the loss would have been directly shifted to the shipper; in the other, it is borne by all of the people. As has been referred to heretofore, the rate structure of the country is most complex, and when any man attempts at a stroke of a pen to increase the freight rates he threatens disaster to the industries of this country. If in 1919 the Director General had started an investigation as to a possible increase, with the business of the country at that time unsettled, it would have been further affected by the uncertainty of the result of the investigation—the effect would have been disastrous to the business interests of the country.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. With reference to the suggestion that the gentleman made as to the purpose of the bill that was passed giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to suspend rates, if the gentleman will permit, I do not believe that his statement is accurate. The purpose of that bill—and I want to make just a short statement about it—the purpose of that bill was to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to suspend rates, to suspend the rates in the event that they were inequitable; and the Director General stated that he had no difficulty with the Interstate Commerce Commission, that they were working together in these matters, and the interstate rates are 85 per cent of our rates. It was my understanding that the President vetoed the bill in order that he might have the unhampered power to control the situation of the rates since he was responsible absolutely for the revenues and the expenses.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have now forgotten what the language of the President was in his veto message, but I do not think he declared or intimated any purpose to increase the rates. Congress did not attempt to pass the bill over his veto. What I contend is this, that the Director General of Railroads did absolutely right in complying with the expressed policy of the Congress, and if he had not done it Members of the House on that side of the aisle would have visited upon him the severest criticism.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is not justified in interpreting that legislation for this side of the House. He may interpret it for his side of the House if he so desires, but there was, so far as the support of that legislation on this side of the House was concerned, nobody who ever dreamed that it was intended to prevent the increase of rates, and I have never heard that suggested anywhere until this moment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I would like to know what the purpose was in giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission, then, the power to suspend any increased rate that was announced by the President of the United States or the Director General of Railroads.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, I will tell him.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. All right.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. In a short sentence I may say the purpose was not to prevent increase of rates at all, but the purpose was to prevent the great inequities that have arisen from the fact that the Director General had not had the long experience that the Interstate Commerce Commission has had with respect to these rates and that when he established an increase of rates an outcry from the country was inevitably forthcoming.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. As I said before, the only increase of rates that was granted was granted only after the traffic experts of the railroads of the country themselves had considered it, and it was on their advice that that increase was granted; and the inequities that the gentleman speaks of are inseparable, as he knows, from any revision of freight rates. And because that is true the railroads of the country to-day, though they have been considering the matter since last October, are unable to frame a plan for an increase of rates to take care of the situation as it now stands. There never was any reason for the passage of the bill in question except that this Congress wanted to prevent any increase of rates by the Director General. I care not what the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says. I do not seek to interpret that legislation for him. I am satisfied he knew nothing about it and accepted the interpretation of the gentleman who was in charge of the bill. But the debate will show that the purpose of that restriction upon the action of the Director General was to prevent any increase of rate by the Director General at the time. What else could have been its purpose? Does not the gentleman know that any change necessarily must have been an increase? Does he not believe that every increase granted would have been questioned by some shipper as being inequitable and unfair to him, and the result would have been that you could not have made the increase?

The man engaged in any industry who saw another industry asking for a suspension of rates because of an inequity and would not ask to have his rate suspended would be showing lack of business judgment. That would necessarily have been the result. It was contended in the House and Senate that the hostilities having ceased, the country having returned to peace conditions, the President should not exercise this arbitrary power. Nobody wants to pay increased freight or passenger rates any more than anybody wants to pay increased taxes. We hate to pay them. That is the reason why some people have criticized the Railroad Administration, forgetting all the time that they pay three or four times more for shoes and every other commodity than they did seven years ago. Yet they seemingly thought the railroad men should not receive an increase of wages, and that the railroads should not increase freight or passenger rates.

An additional reason why the rates should not have been increased during the latter part of 1919 is the fact that all men knew the roads were about to be returned to private ownership. The President announced that they were to be turned back January 1. Afterwards a 60-day extension of time was granted, but we knew the railroads were going to be returned to private control. And if in the face of that announcement the President of the United States or the Director General had gone ahead and issued an arbitrary increase of rates, despite the fact that in all justice it ought to be left until the roads were returned to private control, when a fair and adequate increase of compensation could be granted after a full investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, they would have been properly subjected to criticism, and I would have criticized them as much as any other man in this House. Having some regard for the best interest of the people of America they refrained from doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I think when the history of the war is written and partisanship has disappeared the fair man of another day will say that in the history of this country there is nothing of which we can be more justly proud than the handling of our transportation system during the war, and the thanks of America must ever be due to William G. McAdoo, Walker Hines, and their associates who labored so zealously and intelligently in administering the gigantic business of the railroads of the Nation and made possible their wonderful contribution to the successful prosecution of the war. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, to-day is the second anniversary of the Battle of Seicheprey. It was not a large battle as measured by the numbers engaged or the ground gained and lost. It had, however, an importance at the time and a historical significance to which I shall allude later. For me

there is a special interest connected with the personnel of the troops engaged on the American side. They belonged to the Twenty-sixth, or Yankee, Division and to the One hundred and second Infantry Regiment of that division, which was made up by combining the First and Second Regiments of Connecticut, the latter of which was my old National Guard regiment. I was a member of this organization as enlisted man and officer for nearly 20 years. The two companies principally engaged in this fight were Companies C and D. When I was a captain, I commanded Company D, and when I was a major Company C belonged to my battalion. Another Member of this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN], commanded Company C when he resided in my city. Many of the young men who were members of these two companies were and are personal friends of mine. In many instances I knew their fathers and mothers.

The Twenty-sixth Division, known as the Yankee Division, was the first of the National Guard divisions to go to France. Some of its elements were delayed in getting over, so that the entire division with all its units complete did not arrive in France until very late in the year 1917.

In order to help make clear what I have to say, I have here three maps, one a 1 over 200,000 map, showing the entire western front from the North Sea to Switzerland, another the battle map of the Battle of Seicheprey, showing the entire division sector, which on the larger map is at the point which I indicate, and the third is a greatly enlarged copy of the small rectangular area near the center of the battle map [indicating].

Early in February, 1918, the Yankee Division went into the line northeast of Soissons and began its preliminary training by battalions and companies with the French troops.

On March 19 this division had finished their training with the French, and went by rail to Bar-sur-Aube. From this point they were to march overland by a divisional march and execute maneuvers which would bring them finally to their billets northeast of Chaumont. After they had arrived at their billets they were to consume the entire month of April in further perfecting themselves in the lessons they had learned with the French, so that it was probably calculated that by the 1st of May they would be sufficiently trained to go into the line.

On March 21 occurred the great German drive into Picardy, and this changed all plans. It now became necessary, in order to save a desperate situation, that all American troops available, whether well trained or not, should go into the line. Therefore it was decided to move the First Division of Regulars, which was the first one over to France, from their position at Seicheprey, in the Toul sector, and send them into the Montdidier sector, near the extreme west, in order to help stem the German flood there. On April 1 the Yankee Division, without rest and without any training whatever by division, were sent into this sector to relieve the First Division.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman please state the relative time when the One hundred and second Regiment, or the Yankee Division, arrived in France, as compared to the arrival of some of the other emergency divisions? I mean by that as against the Regular divisions.

Mr. TILSON. I do not remember the order in which they arrived, but the First Division went over first of all. I do not know whether or not there were any other Regular divisions complete before the Yankee Division began to arrive overseas. On account of a breakdown of one of the boats some elements of the division were delayed and did not arrive promptly, possibly not before the Second Regulars or the Rainbow Division arrived completely. As I now recall, the latter arrived about as soon as the last elements of the Twenty-sixth Division arrived.

The sector as held by the First Division at Seicheprey was a 12-kilometer sector, but in order to hold the line by as few troops as possible the sector was extended when the Twenty-sixth Division took it over, so that they took the entire sector of the First Division and part of the sector of the French division on their right. Therefore the Twenty-sixth Division held a 17½-kilometer sector, including the portion of the line where the First Division had held only a 12-kilometer front.

The Twenty-sixth Division had been reduced considerably and had not received replacements, so that the 12 rifle companies of the One hundred and second Regiment had on the average only 186 men to a company, instead of the 250 men allowed by the organization tables. The result was that at the time of the Battle of Seicheprey the front was being held by 35 rifles to the 100 yards, instead of 60 rifles to the 100 yards, which had been regarded as about the right number on a "quiet" front. The

French required 50 rifles to the 100 yards, while with the English troops sometimes as high as 160 rifles were used to the 100 yards. Therefore in considering the events of April 20 it is important to bear in mind that the One hundred and second Infantry, in doing its part to meet the crisis brought about by the great German attack of March 21, was called upon to defend a front only one-half of which would, under normal circumstances, have been placed upon a single regiment.

On the night of April 19-20 the First Battalion, One hundred and second Infantry, relieved the Third Battalion in what was known as "Center F." As shown by the map, "Center F" included the towns of Seicheprey and Beaumont, and its area—rectangular in shape—was about 2 kilometers by 3 kilometers. The plan of defense divided this area into two positions—one in advance of and including Seicheprey, known as position 1, and the other along and to the north of the Beaumont-Metz highway, known as position 1-bis. It was not considered possible to hold position 1 in the face of a determined attack.

Upon completion of the relief Company C and Company D, less one platoon, were in position 1, while Companies A and B, plus one platoon of Company D, were in position 1-bis. Battalion headquarters were in the southern portion of the town of Seicheprey. To the west of the First Battalion was the Second Battalion with Company E in the front line, or outpost position.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. What is the distance between the blue line and the red line?

Mr. TILSON. The blue line represents the German front wire, while the red line represents the American front wire. The distance between them varies very widely. The gentleman will see that these large squares, which are a foot or more, represent a kilometer. The entire map is only about 4½ kilometers in height. Gentlemen will notice that the front-line trench here is the Sibille trench, which lies almost parallel with the front wire in front of the village of Seicheprey.

The First Battalion had hardly completed taking over its positions, as indicated above, when, at about 3 o'clock on the morning of April 20, the enemy put down an exceedingly heavy artillery fire on the entire zone of the One hundred and second Infantry. Within a few minutes all telephone communication had been cut, and such communication as could be had with the smaller units was by runner. At 5 o'clock, under cover of a dense fog and protected by the heaviest kind of an artillery barrage, the enemy attacked the entire front held by the First Battalion of the One hundred and second Infantry, that part of the front immediately west of Seicheprey held by Company E of the Second Battalion, and with artillery the remainder of the front held by the One hundred and second Infantry.

The number of German infantry in the attack has been estimated at 1,800 picked troops, while the minimum estimate is that the German attackers numbered about 1,200 men. This strength and the determination shown by the enemy would indicate that the attack was more than an ordinary raid for the purpose of securing information. The exact purpose of the attack is not definitely known. One impression, shared by the French as well as our own officers, was that the Germans intended to seize and hold the Beaumont-Metz highway in the vicinity of Beaumont. Another view is that the enemy's intention was to seize and hold all ground gained in the vicinity of Seicheprey, and especially the Sibille trench, just to the north of Seicheprey.

Whatever the enemy's intention, his terrific artillery fire, and the picked men, enormously outnumbering our weak elements in position 1, with which he followed his artillery barrage, soon overcame our small outposts in the front-line positions and the enemy succeeded in penetrating the northern outskirts of Seicheprey; but Maj. Rau and a few remaining men of Companies C and D held on to the southern edge of Seicheprey and were never driven therefrom. Reinforcements from Companies A and B in position 1-bis were brought up and the Germans were soon driven out of Seicheprey and back to the Sibille trench. Later on in the day and during the night the Germans were driven from the Sibille trench, and on the morning of the 21st the Americans were again in full position of the ground which the Germans had been enabled to occupy for only a few hours as a result of their overwhelming attack of the day before.

More than 40 Germans were buried by the Americans, and doubtless many were carried away by their comrades. The quantity and character of the matériel left in the Sibille trench indicated that the enemy had made a hasty retreat. The saddest and most unfortunate part of the affair was that there were 58 Americans killed, 145 wounded, and 226 missing. Most of

the missing were captured and carried away to German prisons, where most of them lived through the war and have since returned to their homes.

I said in the beginning that this was not a great battle. It has been called a raid in force, although I think it was too large for that. While not rising to the dignity of an offensive, perhaps it might properly be called a small local offensive. Nevertheless the Battle of Seicheprey was historically important. It was the first powerful attack by the Germans directed against an all-American sector. In the next place, it was the first try out of National Guard troops. It has been thought by some that the Germans upon learning that a National Guard division had come into the line seized this opportunity to demonstrate that they were not dependable. If this were the purpose, it proved a failure from the German point of view. So far as the number of casualties inflicted was concerned, it was a German success, for the American losses were heavy in proportion to the number of troops engaged. The weakened elements in the front line were simply overwhelmed. The attack utterly failed to hold any ground gained, and it never reached the line of resistance even of the first battalion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, could I have just about a minute more?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, so far as the Americans were concerned, there were doubtless many lessons to be learned from the attack at Seicheprey. These lessons, however, concerned the combined operations of large bodies of troops, and no criticism can be made of the conduct of the small units of the One hundred and second Infantry, which bore the brunt of the attack. The consensus of all reports concerning the action of individuals and small units is that their conduct was admirable in every respect. The commanding officer of the One hundred and second Infantry, Col. John H. Parker, characterized the conduct of individuals and units of his regiment as being "beyond praise, heroic, and sublime." Brig. Gen. Fox Conner, chief of operations on Gen. Pershing's staff, in commenting upon the affair at Seicheprey, says: "Notwithstanding the heavy losses of the First Battalion, One hundred and second Infantry, its morale was not only unbroken but it remained ready and willing to undergo any sacrifices which it might be called upon to make. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MacCRATE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4163) to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following House concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 54.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 11578) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to number the sections consecutively.

The message also announced that Mr. POINDEXTER was excused, at his own request, from further service as a conferee on the bill (H. R. 11927) to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Coast Guard through the temporary provision of bonuses or increased compensation, and Mr. KEYES was appointed in his place.

RAILROAD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I well remember when the bill was pending in the House to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to suspend rates made by the President. I opposed it. I insisted then that it was an absurdity to require the President, who is not an expert on rates, to initiate rates for an expert body to immediately suspend. I offered an amendment on the floor of the House authorizing the carriers to file rate increases subject to suspension by the Interstate Commerce Commission instead of the President, because the carriers knew better what rates they wanted, they knew better what rates they needed. My amendment was voted down with a dull, sickening thud. The reason for it was that if the carriers suggested increases of rates, and they were suspended by the commission, it did not deprive the State commissions of the power to pass

upon State-made rates, and the covert and camouflaged purpose of having the President initiate rates was that the Interstate Commerce Commission might suspend them so far as they applied to interstate rates, but that the State commissions would have no power in so far as intrastate rates were concerned. Those are the facts, and when the President vetoed the bill, I saw in a newspaper—I do not know whether it was true or not—that the leader on that side, Mr. MONDELL, said that the President did right, and that the bill ought never to have been passed. As I recall, Mr. MONDELL advocated the passage of the bill.

I want to refer to another matter. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] says it is proposed now by the railroads to increase the rates on freight over and above the Government war-made rates 25 per cent. The Director General increased passenger fares at the same time, relatively in proportion to the increase of freight rates. Why do not the carriers now ask to increase the passenger rates 25 per cent? I can tell you why, and you know it without being told. I am not blaming the railroads. It is because the passengers vote and run for offices and hold offices and can talk, abuse, and denounce the railroads, and if they increase passenger rates the railroads know that there would be a howl go up from every man who bought a ticket.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Was that the reason that Mr. McAdoo as the Director General took off the extra fares that he had put on for the privilege of riding in a Pullman or chair car?

Mr. SIMS. I was going to refer to that; I thought the gentleman himself would, but he did not. Why do they not ask for an increase in passenger rates? I have given you the reason, and it is a good one. They want to put it on freight, so that it is charged up to the ultimate consumer, with profits added every time it takes a turnover, and in that way they get their money without the man who pays it knowing how much he pays. I do not blame the railroads; they know how selfish human beings are, and when a man can see in advance the rate he has to pay he will howl, but when the poor and also the rich have to pay an increased price for meat, for bread, for flour, for coal, for sugar, for lumber, they do not see just how much of it is caused by the increase in freight. That is the reason for it. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] refers to the fact that the director general, Mr. McAdoo, in making the passenger rates, had added one-half a cent a car-mile for the privilege of traveling upon a Pullman car instead of in a day coach. The Director General never did a more righteous or just thing when he did that very thing, but a howl went up in protest by the well-to-do who could travel in Pullmans, and it was charged that the poor widow, or the soldier's wife or mother, would have to sit up all night in a day coach in order to save that half cent a mile extra fare, and Mr. McAdoo—it was he and not Mr. Hines who was then Director General—and he, being tender-hearted like Members of Congress, took off the half cent on all Pullman passengers rather than force the wives and mothers of soldiers who were not able to pay the extra fare to sit up all night in day coaches.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman says that Mr. McAdoo had a tender heart. Was that a tender heart on his part or a sensitive ear?

Mr. SIMS. It was a tender heart. He had been traveling through the South at that time advocating the purchase of Liberty bonds, as I am told—I did not talk to him about it—and saw the poor widows and the wives and mothers of the soldiers were the sufferers, which broke down his adamant intention to continue the extra charge. Why do not the railroads ask for it now? It is nothing but just and right. The war is over and no soldiers' wives and mothers are forced to pay it while husbands and sons were dying in battle. A Pullman car weighs nearly twice as much as a day coach, and costs much more money to build. It takes more motive power to haul it. Why should not a gentleman who is able to travel in a Pullman car pay an increased fare? Why not increase his fare over the fare of those who are not able to travel in Pullman cars, who have to sit up all night, and why not reduce the fare of such people by half a cent or even a quarter of a cent per mile? But I predict that you will see nothing of that sort done. Private ownership means operation for profit. That being its object and purpose, it will never do anything that does not promise the greatest amount of profit. That is all that people invest in it for, and that is the only reason that you and I would invest in it—nothing else on earth but profit on investment. Without such a motive not another private dollar will ever be invested in a share of railroad stock.

What else do carriers do? Their roads have always carried, and to-day are carrying more than they ever did before, a large volume of traffic free of charge. That is the free transportation

of baggage. Now, trunks do not vote, but the men and women who own them, and to which personal service is more expensive to the railroads to render than to the passengers, do vote, and therefore their trunks get free passes. Why not let you and I who carry a trunk pay a just and reasonable charge for the carrying of them? Mr. Cass, from the State of Iowa, told me, when I inquired of him in a hearing, that the baggage carried free was equal to at least 15 per cent of the whole cost of passenger traffic. Now, why do it? I traveled with a gentleman who is the business partner of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS]. I was going from here to San Francisco and he was going from here to Ogden. I had a trunk that weighed about 125 pounds, and my trunk was carried to San Francisco for nothing. It had to be changed from car to car—personal attention, personal service.

The partner of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS] had no trunk, but he had to pay just as much as I did from here to Ogden and received less service and cost the railroad less to carry him without baggage than it did to carry me. Why do not the rail carriers put on a reasonable charge for carrying baggage, a rate that would at least pay the carrier out of pocket cost? Why should not the railroads in the name of common honesty and common sense get the actual cost of the service to them? I offered such an amendment in the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and they voted it down. I then offered it in the full committee—I am giving away no committee secrets, because I am not going to tell who voted for it and who voted against it—but it failed to pass, and it will not do so here; you will not vote for it. Now, you know there are thousands of commercial travelers who are traveling as a matter of business and profit to their employers. They carry baggage containing samples for business purposes. They are carried free up to 150 pounds per passenger all over this country. These sample trunks are not used to carry the personal wearing apparel of the drummers, but are used exclusively for business purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. If I can get more time I will be glad to answer questions.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from South Carolina was called away from the Chamber and asked me to control the time, there being no member of the Committee on Appropriations present, and I yield three minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. SIMS. I yield.

Mr. FIELDS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the baggage of commercial travelers, the entire baggage, is carried free?

Mr. SIMS. Only up to 150 pounds, like anybody else's.

Mr. FIELDS. One might infer from the gentleman's remarks that all baggage was carried free.

Mr. SIMS. It is the same as anybody else's.

Mr. FIELDS. That is, he is entitled to 150 pounds free?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; and they are traveling every day as a matter of business.

Mr. FIELDS. I have been a commercial traveler and carried four, five, and seven trunks, and I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that they ought to pay for the baggage that they carry.

Mr. SIMS. Pay all alike; but the railroads will not make the charge. Trunks do not vote, but their owners do, and this whole scheme of private ownership for profit involves such uneconomical practices, which the railroad can not well prevent. Now, what should the railroads do? They might put on a reasonable graduated charge for baggage of all kinds, increasing it when it goes up, charging less for the first 150 pounds. And now we have a United States Express Co. that operates all over the United States, everywhere that a rail line is operated. It will send to your house wherever you live and take your trunk and deliver it at your hotel or wherever you are going at the end of your journey for a reasonable charge. Now, why should we want an increased freight paid on wheat, corn, cotton, cattle, eggs, and butter and at the same time have our trunks that carry our wearing apparel carried free? I think that, as the railroads now are trying to increase freight rates from 25 to 30 per cent, they should at least charge for carrying baggage a sufficient amount to pay them all actual expenses which they incur by reason of such baggage transportation service.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If the railroads were under Government ownership, would not there be the same inducement to let the trunk owners carry their trunks free by those who control it, just the same as under private ownership?

Mr. SIMS. I rather think if the Government was carrying baggage free to the passenger, but at a public expense, that the gentleman would hardly vote against a reasonable charge upon his trunk for the service rendered by the carrier. I hardly think he would want the Government to incur a deficit and take it out of the taxpayers on account of this free service thus given.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am not saying that would not be true, but I am asking the gentleman if the same inducement would not exist?

Mr. SIMS. The same temptation always exists not to pay what a service is worth, if we can get it for less or for nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while the House of Representatives was considering an item in the District of Columbia appropriation bill a few days ago I indicated that a certain teacher in the Central High School of this city had been teaching that which in my opinion would tend to undermine the Government.

The principal of that school, Prof. Maurer, was quoted by the daily press as stating that the charge was "not serious."

In a report to Supt. Thurston, dated April 1, Prof. Maurer finds in favor of the teacher but says, in part, in regard to this case:

Almost all of her pupils express themselves as never having left her classes with a feeling that any reflections had been cast upon our country or its Government in comparison with any other nation or upon its public men.

You will note he says "almost all" of her pupils, and so forth. My contention is that this teacher nor any other teacher has the right to send any pupil from her classes "with a feeling that any reflections had been cast upon our country or its Government in comparison with any other nation."

Mr. Chairman, teachers should Americanize foreigners, not foreignize Americans.

The report states further:

I find that those pupils who do recall criticism recollect a very few at most of such occasions—

Which again indicates such criticisms were made and on several occasions.

The report further states:

It is, of course, true that the courses Miss ——— is now teaching are yet incomplete and not fully developed. The true index of her teaching is in the influence left by her finished work with the class, and the fact should be stated that our students of history do not get the full understanding or appreciation of the American Constitution until their senior year, following the study of the European countries.

From this I conclude a freshman, sophomore, or junior may gain wrong impressions, but that these will all be corrected in their senior year. This is dangerous business, Mr. Chairman.

This report was based largely, so I am informed, on anonymous answers to questions furnished the pupils. While I have been three times refused an examination of these answers, the principal stated to me over the phone that a number of the answers bore testimony to the facts substantially as I stated to the House on a previous occasion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have neither time nor disposition to enter the secret service, and neither am I going to embarrass any child nor any parent, but a little information from parents throws interesting sidelight on this whole question.

One parent says:

As a parent, whose son has been compelled to listen to her vicious teachings for almost a year, I am bitterly opposed to seeing her get off without being taught a severe lesson.

Myself and other parents have been greatly incensed during the entire year to think that she has been allowed to pursue the tactics she has employed. Please continue your good work.

And so forth.

Another parent, a cool, calm, sensible business man, tells me he has been incensed at the reports brought to him by his daughter on numerous occasions.

He has repeatedly found it advisable to go over the points at issue with his daughter—who declares she likes this teacher—and thus modify or change her viewpoint.

He tells me he finally concluded the teacher was a citizen of another country and was prejudiced in her teaching in favor of that country.

Another parent, a highly intellectual gentleman, who has resided in this city for many years, states that he removed his daughter from another school in this city some time ago because

of the bolshevistic, socialistic, and other teachings she was receiving.

He states that one socialist teacher, who is not now in the schools, used to invite the children to see her after school if they wanted further information along the same line.

I am informed there is a socialist organization, with a high-sounding, beguiling title, with headquarters in New York, whose whole object is to openly or secretly teach socialism and Bolshevism in our schools and colleges.

I am informed that a group of students in one of our great universities is doing personal work among other students and signing them up as members and supporters of the New York organization. It is presumed the same slimy work is being done in other colleges and universities.

Under recent date a patriotic young friend of mine writes me as follows:

I have made a casual investigation of the magazine put into the hands of college students by the Intercollegiate Socialist Society of New York, and find it impregnated with articles by such dubious characters as Berger. There are also lavish eulogiums on Debs. I have not had the time to read searchingly into the contents of the articles and can not accordingly adduce positive incriminating evidence, unless the panegyrics on Debs and the contributions of Berger be considered illicit.

An examination on your part will bring the truth of the situation. My knowledge of Berger leads me to form the opinion that if he was not worthy enough to be a Member of Congress, he is not sufficiently estimable to be allowed to exert this influence on the minds of college students. The absorption of these ideas must necessarily find expression for the worst in manhood. It is for you to judge whether his teachings are destructive or stimulating. Certainly a man who has been condemned by the courts of the country is not a model for emulation or an incentive for popular applause.

In college I have already formed the belief that if while here one does not absorb a profound veneration for his country, then the educational system of the country will only be placing power in the hands of those who would jeopardize our national existence. Americanization is too slow in operation. I see no efforts about me. There are no monthly talks on this subject, not even yearly, unless I have been sound asleep. Progressive ideas should be encouraged, but there should be a differentiation between those that have the interest of the country in mind and those that would encourage fanaticism for mistaken martyrdom, oblivious to its unsoundness and only animated by a feverish desire to renovate.

Recently there was issued to college boys who are members of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society invitations to attend a "civic club meeting" on April 15 in New York City. Following this was a brazen line beginning, "A round up of the free for the benefit of the bound," and even worse, by Red Doran. You will recall that this person has connections with the I. W. W.'s and has been indicted about three times, being now on bail. To continue: Under this was a line to the effect that Red Doran would conduct a Dutch auction. This is enigmatical, but it was not meant in levity. It closed with an appeal to those who were coming to bring money, the proceeds of which would be split up between the Centralia and the Intercollegiate Society. The Centralia is an effort to free indicted I. W. W.'s. I do not know how many have contemplated accepting the invitation, but this, I think, may be implicitly assumed that all college members of this society received a request to attend. * * *

This is but a compendium but I think the danger is plain. Of course I may be mislead as to the real significance of this and I advise you to look the ground over for yourself. It is the deep conviction that this is but an example of the protean anarchy that is rife in the country that induces me to protest against this organization. A suppression of baleful propaganda is not a suppression of public opinion because this is not public opinion. The great conservative masses do not sanction it, but a few ingenious and determined bellowers can often overcome a tremendous majority.

An attack on the college that I am attending with evidence furnished by me would be matricidal on my part and with my respect for the greatness and traditions of the college would be a severe blow to me.

This is not only here, it is prevalent. I write to you as a man very interested in Americanization and hope that this letter may be of service to you in the great work of safeguarding the future by indoctrinating the youth with sound principles.

Very sincerely,

For the protection of this student I can not reveal his name nor the name of the college, which he attends, but it is one of the largest and best known educational institutions in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this interests every educator in America. The letter from this young man, in my judgment, should be read to the general assembly of every high school and every college in the country with appropriate comments by the president or principal. To be forewarned is to be forearmed against this treacherous organization.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if the seeds of disrespect and disloyalty are sown, whether maliciously or thoughtlessly, in our free public schools, and are further cultivated in our colleges and universities, I declare we are sowing the wind and shall reap the whirlwind.

No Member has a higher regard for teachers and for the teaching profession than I. In the main they are well equipped for their duties by years of hard study at great expense, but are shamefully underpaid.

I am in favor of raising the salaries of all competent, loyal teachers and of dropping the others. The child's mind is en-

titled to the very best. Poor teachers are too dear and too dangerous at any price. But so long as they do teach, I insist that they teach good, old-fashioned Americanism, and if they do not, then cancel their certificates and create an everlasting vacancy so far as that teacher is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, while I am making an honest effort to have the American's creed drilled into the minds and into the hearts of every school boy and girl in my State of Washington, I am unwilling that any teacher in the National Capital shall be planting the seeds of national destruction under the very shadow of this dome.

Through the public schools of America lies the path to national preservation, and there is no other.

The quality of patriotism that springs from our schools must grade 100 per cent, and nothing less will meet the demands of the hour. A faith in our country and its institutions that is broad and deep must be instilled into the heart of every boy and girl.

I am not concerned with any passing criticism of Congress. The Constitutional Convention, composed of the intellectual giants of the centuries, and every deliberative and legislative body that ever met before or since, has been criticized, but I do object to any teacher, in her capacity as a teacher, criticizing one of the organic branches of this Government.

But perhaps my notions of patriotism are old-fashioned and out of date. I believe in the United States of America. I know it is the best Government on earth, and I can not and I will not sit idly by when any school or teacher repeatedly derides before her pupils the lawmaking body of this Government, nor when she leaves a lingering thought in any pupil's mind that some other Government is superior to his own.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in schools and school-teachers, but over and above all I am interested in the children.

While the Senate committee investigates the school situation I trust they will inspect the answers to the questionnaires as made by all the children, to the end that all the facts may be known and full justice may be done the teacher and this question.

The schools of Washington, D. C., should lead the Nation, and if the school turmoil that has been aired by the city press three times daily for months can be settled in no other way, then I hope the Senate committee may recommend that we wipe out the contentious factions and disturbing factors and give to the children of this city the wholesome, patriotic instruction to which they are entitled.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman, I am sure, will agree that it would be unfair to all the teachers of this District not to give the name of this particular teacher. It casts an aspersion upon the character of every teacher in the section, and I think the gentleman ought to name the teacher.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that even the school children at the Central High School, after the remarks I made here some two or three weeks ago, said that they thought that is Miss So-and-so, and I hesitate to give the name. I think this will all be brought out, probably, in the Senate committee hearings within the next two or three days.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman answer this question: Is it or is it not Miss Ditto?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Well, I called no names, if the gentleman will pardon me, in connection with this.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will say it is not, I do not care to ask him.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will say this, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I have answered the question for the principal of that school and for the superintendent of the city schools, and it is up to them to make the investigation. There is no secret about that. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the United States who hates disloyalty more than I do. There is no man in the United States who would do more to free not only our schools but our whole Government of all socialism, of Bolshevism, and of anarchy than I would. I have taught my children to hate it and have taught them to love their flag, their Government, and its principles. I would not be doing my duty to my children or to myself or to my country, however, did I not

rise at this time in defense of the absent teacher whose reputation has been attacked here by my esteemed friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS]. I asked him to give the name of this teacher, and he refused. He thus leaves every teacher in Washington under this cloud. When he made his former remarks some time ago on the floor concerning this particular teacher I made inquiry and found that his charges were directed against Miss Ditto, who teaches history in the Central High School. I happen to know well the superintendent of the public schools of this District, Mr. Thurston. He is an excellent gentleman and an able executive. It was my pleasure and privilege to have a conference with him at a time during the war when he was arranging intensive courses for the boys in the high schools in this District in order that they might graduate before time, in order to enter the service of their country. I am also acquainted with the principal of the Central High School, Mr. Maurer, and other teachers there—Mr. Jones and Mr. Burroughs and others—who are men of high standing and high intelligence and high patriotism. I happen to have three children who have been in attendance at this Central High School, and most, if not all, have been in the classes of this particular Miss Ditto. It is my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with a big bunch of the splendid young men up there in the Central High School, of the two thousand five hundred and odd pupils who attend there daily. So interested was I to know if my children were attending the class of a teacher who was teaching anything but true Americanism in this District that I went to boy after boy who has been in her class, and every single one of them told me that there is no finer teacher in Washington than this particular Miss Ditto. I asked my own boys, who hate Bolshevism like I hate a rattlesnake, if there was anything wrong with this particular Miss Ditto, and they said they had never been under a teacher in their whole life whom they liked better and who taught them better the principles of this Government and loyalty to their country and their flag. My little daughter tells me the same thing. Why, I learned upon investigation that this Miss Ditto has spent the very best part of her life here in the District of Columbia teaching the young men and the young women of Washington.

Is her reputation, with so little investigation as this, to be wiped away on the floor of the House in a moment by such indirect accusations? Why, my distinguished friend from Washington tells us in the same breath in which he makes his charges that the principal of this school gave this matter investigation and exonerated the teacher. If he did that, why can not my friend from Washington be fair enough to this poor woman, who works hard day after day on a small salary, teaching the youth of this land, to drop his charges, unless he can bring more foundation and more basis here, and give names when he is asked for names? I say it is unfair to her and it is unfair to the teachers of this District. I want to say that I do not believe there is a man who will claim that I will mince or whitewash matters when it comes to Bolshevism. I have said on this floor—and I have been one of the few men who have said on this floor—that that teacher who was caught and adjudged guilty of teaching Bolshevism and who was suspended for one week—Miss Woods—should have been dismissed immediately from the schools and not allowed to come back. That is what I have said; and any other teacher not absolutely loyal should be dismissed. There is not a man here who believes I will wink at anything of the kind. I am perfectly willing for my children to be taught by Miss Ditto, for I sincerely believe her to be an able, efficient, loyal, deserving, patriotic teacher.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. May I repeat the few words from the report as given by the principals to the city superintendent?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman has had 17 minutes and I have only 10, and I asked him to give the name of this teacher and not leave all the teachers of the District under a cloud. I asked him to give us a little better idea of the charges. He leaves the matter up in innuendo. I would yield to him if he would put in names and facts, but I have only 10 minutes. I want to say I think the gentleman ought to be fair and withdraw these charges. I do not think he ought to be so unkind to this poor woman, who is absent and has no defense here. She can not come here and defend herself. She has been exonerated after proper investigation by the principal of the school, after the attention of the principal was directed to my friend's charges on the floor of the House some time ago. I think he ought to withdraw them, because I do not think it is fair to a teacher who has spent the best part of her life training the young men and young women of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be considerable of a swapping of time around here. Where is the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I yield a minute of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the report to which I referred a bit ago, and from which I quoted, is a report made by the principal of the Central High School to the superintendent of schools in this city. The report is based on answers to questions submitted to the pupils. From that report I quote this language:

"That 'almost all of her pupils expressed themselves as never having left her classes with a feeling that any reflections had been cast upon our country or its Government, in comparison with any other nation, or upon its public men.'"

And my contention is that no child should leave her classes with the feeling that reflections have been cast upon his country, and that he should not have that sort of teaching. And the principal himself, basing his report on the answers made by the children, does not claim that it was unanimous in favor of the teacher.

He admits that there were observations of this kind and reports of this kind made by some of the children. I have no interest in the matter in any way, shape, or form other than as it concerns the welfare of this country and the children of the schools.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us carries an appropriation of \$300,000,000 to pay a portion of the loss incurred through the operation of the railways by the Federal Government, and the chairman of the committee [Mr. Goop], in presenting the report, figures the total loss to the Treasury as the result of the Federal operation of the railways at \$1,375,000,000. I think the gentleman from Iowa would say, if interrogated on the subject, that that was a conservative estimate. Whatever may be our opinion of the necessity of the Federal control of the railways during the war, we should not forget that it cost the American people \$1,375,000,000, and that during that period the service was of a character that would not have been tolerated by the people if the railroads had been under private control and management. As it was, the people put up with all sorts and kinds of curtailments of service, all sorts and kinds of inconvenience, all sorts and kinds of disarrangement of their affairs, in the patriotic belief that it was necessary for them to do that as good citizens. The roads had been taken over by the Government and were being operated by the Government, and as good citizens they felt they must bear with the poor service and pay the high rates of Government operation.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. In what respect would that condition have been improved had the railroads remained under private control during the war?

Mr. MONDELL. It has always been my opinion that the condition would have been better in the long run if the roads had been left in private control. I think that, with legislation granting certain additional authority and removing certain restrictions, the roads would have been more cheaply and more satisfactorily operated if they had remained in private control. But I realize that is all a matter of opinion.

Mr. OLIVER. Did the gentleman make any suggestions looking to that end at the time the railroads were taken over?

Mr. MONDELL. I expressed the opinion that it was of doubtful wisdom and propriety at the time, and I have only made the statement that I have made now in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman because I admit, as we all must, that it is a matter of judgment and opinion, and I have no doubt but that those who believed in taking over the railroads and were instrumental in taking over the railroads were of the opinion that that was essential.

I still, however, adhere to my view that with certain modifications of law the roads would have been more satisfactorily handled under private control, and I think it is well that we should consider those matters and have an opinion upon them, because they have a bearing on the very large question involved as to whether or not the Government can advantageously, economically, and satisfactorily operate the railroads of the country. I do not believe that it can be done under our form of government, and it is perhaps worth while to have had this experience,

as burdensome as it has been, as costly as it has been, as illustrating the difficulty of operating railroads through public agencies.

Gentlemen talk about running the Government on business principles. There never was a government run wholly and entirely on business principles, in my opinion. There may have been somewhere, sometime, an absolute autocracy which, under a very wise autocrat, was run on business principles for a very limited length of time. But under no other form can a government be run on what we are pleased to call business principles. I think everybody who has had anything to do with governmental affairs realizes that, and in some respects and in some regards it is more difficult to operate government affairs on purely business principles under a republic, under a republican form of government, than under an autocracy. That, however, is not an argument against a republican form of government. It is one of those things that go with and are attached to and belong to a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman has the time, will he elaborate that idea? I am really interested to know why an autocracy could make cheaper purchases and sell to greater advantage than a democracy.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, an autocrat, if he was all-wise and all-powerful, could rule without regard to this or that or the other local, temporary, or political influence which sometimes has an ill effect upon management; and if autocracy were all-wise, then autocracy could manage things in the most businesslike way. As, however, there is no such thing as an all-wise or wholly benevolent autocracy we need not give that phase of the matter consideration.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish the gentleman would go into that a little further.

Mr. MONDELL. I could not go into a discussion of that question now. If I had many times 18 minutes I would be glad to talk about it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If the great Creator and Preserver of the Universe, with all power and wisdom, would come down and take charge, He would make a success, would He not?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. That is the kind of an autocracy that would be a success. But we, unfortunately, do not have the benefit of the directing hand of the Infinite and All-Wise in our affairs. It is ordained that we must work out our own salvation, and we can work it out best under a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. And yet under that form, by reason of the limitations of the conditions established by that form, we can not do business, ordinary business, in what is generally known as a thorough business way, and for that reason we can not run railway systems, we can not carry on great business affairs of any sort in a satisfactory way, and the less of it we have the better for all concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so much for that. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] a little while ago referred to the demands that have been made for soldiers' bonus legislation. He expressed himself as having very serious doubt of the wisdom and propriety of that sort of legislation. My opinion and my view with regard to those matters have been well known for a long time. And yet, notwithstanding what I or the gentleman from Iowa may think in regard to the matter, I think it is quite likely that we shall have legislation before this Congress adjourns probably along the lines of the suggestions made by the American Legion; possibly with some considerable modifications. If we are to have such legislation—and I am inclined to think that a majority of the Members of this House expect it to occur and desire it to occur—let us hope that at least we shall be conservative, even as the men and the committees of the legion have been conservative compared with some plans that have been proposed. Let us hope that at least we shall not embark upon wild enterprises involving many, many millions of dollars that the men of the legion have not asked us to embark upon.

And let us also remember in that connection that if we are to legislate, even though our legislation may not involve an ultimate expenditure of more than \$1,000,000,000 or a billion and a half, which, while it is an enormous sum, is very small compared with the sums involved in some of the plans that have been suggested; if we are to legislate even along the most moderate lines we can not pick the money off of the bushes. It may be there are gentlemen—no one in this presence, I hope—who would be delighted to slap the soldier boys on the back, declare

that they have been instrumental in contributing a considerable sum to the income of every one of them, and not have taxed anybody to secure the money. One suggestion of gentlemen who prefer to escape responsibility for taxation, while willing to take the responsibility of voting for a bonus, is that we shall find somewhere malefactors of great wealth or those who have made large sums out of huge war profits, and take the money away from them, and thus meet this obligation. That would all be very lovely if one could invent some machinery whereby you might pick out the real profiteer, the men who have accumulated vast sums improperly, and tax their wealth and at the same time avoid confiscating the legitimate earnings of a very great many good people. I recollect when I was a boy a certain not very successful hunter, who had been unfortunate enough, through mistake, to shoot some of his neighbor's live stock, who is reported to have said he would give anything for a gun that was warranted to kill if it was a deer and miss if it was a calf. [Laughter.] Now, any gentleman who can invent that kind of a tax-raising gun would be warranted in going after alleged profits in raising the sums to pay the soldiers' bonuses; but there is not a man under the flag who has studied the subject who does not know that we have already gone to the limit and beyond in our so-called excess-profits taxes, and who does not know that now, in spite of the best efforts of those charged with the collection of these taxes to deal equitably, we are levying upon the capital of many of our citizens under the guise of profits taxes; that we are preventing the development of enterprise; that we are tying up, all over the country, legitimate development and putting a handicap on helpful enterprise by these high taxes which for the present we are not able to repeal because up to date we have not been able to bring our expenditures to a point where they can be repealed and still leave us an income sufficient to meet our outlay.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does not the gentleman think he would better have deferred that speech until after the meeting of the Republican caucus on Thursday night?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman having asked that bright question, I will yield to him time enough to answer it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Of course, the gentleman failing to answer it himself would naturally like to put it back to me, but after the meeting of the Republican caucus does not the gentleman think his speech would have been more timely and probably more appropriate and more in accord with the decision of the gentleman's party on that question?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course I must be the judge of the propriety and the timeliness of my remarks.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And therefore the gentleman has handed back to me the question that I propounded to him.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman wants something to think about let him chew this cud: It has been currently reported—I hope without sufficient ground—that gentlemen on the Democratic side are awaiting an opportunity to raise the bonus bill to the sky limit and beyond, not because they desire to aid the soldiers in that way, but because they think that would be good politics; and, having done that, then to work out some weird, fantastic form of revenue raising that might appeal to the unthinking and uninformed. I hope that is not true, but that is the current rumor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the American Legion has asked certain things. It has not demanded them, but has asked them of Congress. Personally, and as a Member from Wyoming, I have not believed in a cash bonus. But I have other responsibilities here than that of the Member from Wyoming, and one of them is to attempt to carry out the will and wish of the majority as I understand it, and I am inclined to think that there will be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that I may have two minutes more.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope whatever legislation is enacted will be conservative. I certainly hope we shall not do more for the ex-service men than they themselves have asked. We can hardly be expected to do more than they ask. We can not honestly do more in this House than they ask. Having drawn a conservative bill, if certain gentlemen of the minority can not join with us in passing it I hope at least they will not try to ditch the thing by making it grotesque in its extravagances.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield. I have only two minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. Can the majority leader give us any information as to when the bonus bill will be presented to the House?

Mr. MONDELL. No, I can not, because it is a matter that requires a considerable amount of careful study in its details, but I am sure it will be presented within a reasonable time. And having presented a reasonable proposition, I hope that we shall also provide a reasonable method of raising the revenue; that we shall not attempt to camouflage, or interpose smoke screens, or propose legislation which, while it may appeal to people who have not taken the trouble to consider the situation, will not commend itself to the sound judgment of the American people.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has referred to the program outlined by the American Legion. Does the gentleman propose to follow that program?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman now speaking has nothing whatever to do with the program, but I express the hope we shall follow the legion program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If I have any time left, I yield it to the gentleman from Wyoming.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for seven additional minutes.

Mr. GARNER. I think that will be sufficient time to answer my question. [Laughter.] The gentleman has said that he hopes the minority will not undertake to make a grotesque proposition out of the desire to comply with the request of the American Legion for legislation on this subject. I want to ask the gentleman if he is willing to take the program outlined by the American Legion?

Mr. MONDELL. I am willing to take the program as outlined by the legion as it may be presented after careful consideration by the membership of the committee to which the House has referred the subject.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, if I understand the gentleman, he is going to support whatever proposition the Ways and Means Committee bring out on this subject. That is very nice. Now, may I ask the gentleman another question? Will he give the minority an opportunity to offer a system of taxation in lieu of what he proposes to offer in his bill? He spoke of our undertaking to collect the revenue in a very uneconomical method. I want to know if the gentleman and his side of the House will give this side of the House an opportunity to offer to the country a scheme by which we can collect this money?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Wyoming will not have the decision in that matter. Speaking for himself as one Member of Congress, he says frankly that so far as he is concerned he would want to be better assured of the absolute good faith of the minority before he gave the minority any too great an opportunity to "spill the beans" or "gum the cards." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is the reason I asked the gentleman to postpone his remarks until after the Republican caucus. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming yields back four minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a suggestion to the majority. I do not think probably it is necessary to make it to the minority. The gentleman from Wyoming has suggested to you gentlemen that, in anticipation of your conference, you had better not give us the opportunity to perfect your bill, for if you do give us the opportunity to perfect this piece of legislation you will be able to collect the money from a different source than he would have you collect it from. He would put it on the backs and bellies of the American people, and we would put it on the pockets of those best able to pay. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Furthermore, he proposes to do an injustice to some soldiers, and we propose to treat them all alike. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the difference between the gentleman from Wyoming and the minority. He went on to warn you that if you trusted the minority with the opportunity to perfect this bill, there were enough honest men on your side, legislatively honest men on your side of the House, to join with the minority and put on the statute books a piece of legislation that will be a credit to the country and a service to the American soldiers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman, without knowing what the views are of the gentleman from Wyoming, except that he said

he was in favor of a proposition submitted by the legion, now says that I am in favor of an unfair proposition. Does the gentleman intend to say that the legislation presented by the legion is unfair?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, no; the gentleman from Wyoming does not commit himself to the program of the legion; he modifies it.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Wyoming, if he will permit me to refer to current rumor, is well aware that the bill that he has prepared, or the bill that the Republican Ways and Means Committee has prepared under his direction, takes out of the bill some 1,200,000 soldiers when there was no testimony before the Ways and Means Committee that did not say that you should treat them all alike. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I ask the gentleman if he will in his conference, when he has it with his brethren on Thursday, submit a proposition to give the House an opportunity to vote upon the proposition to include all service men in this bill, an opportunity to substitute for your proposition of a consumption tax one to take it out of those who made money out of the war while the war was on? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The gentleman from Iowa has two minutes remaining.

Mr. GOOD. We have nothing more, Mr. Chairman; and I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

The War Finance Corporation, as rapidly as funds become available, shall take over from the United States Railroad Administration, at par value and accrued interest, such of the bonds of the United States of the various Liberty loan issues and the Victory loan issue as are held by the said administration at the time of the approval of this act and which it does not desire to retain.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any information as to how long the Railroad Administration expects to continue functioning?

Mr. GOOD. It was the estimate of the Director General and also of the director of finance that the greater part of these settlements would be adjusted during the year, or, at any rate, settled by the 1st of next March. There is a good deal of question as to just how long it will take to settle the claims of the various carriers. There are a great many pending adjustments. There are claims made by the carriers for under-maintenance and claims made by the Railroad Administration for over-maintenance. The Director General is quite positive that these claims, as far as the Government is concerned, will balance and that they will not be called on to pay any additional sum. It is the intention of the director of finance to settle the claims as promptly as he can with the railroad companies. When it comes to the question of maintenance, the gentleman can well understand that that may involve a good many investigations. Settlements may be based on the amount expended during the Federal control as compared with the amount expended for the test period, or on some other basis.

The question is so big and involves so many roads, so much property, that personally I have no opinion in regard to it. I do think, however, that it is going to take longer than is estimated, much longer. But here are claims that must be paid; here are obligations of the Government that must be discharged. The Railroad Administration owes a great many bills. Some of the railroads are owing the Government. The only way these settlements can be made is for the Railroad Administration to have the money and be prepared to make settlements.

Mr. WALSH. From what source is the War Finance Corporation deriving its funds at present?

Mr. GOOD. The War Finance Corporation had at the last statement I have seen something over \$600,000,000 of assets. The capital stock to start with was \$500,000,000, all of which was appropriated out of the United States Treasury, and then the corporation was authorized to issue its notes. It has done that. I think it has retired some of its obligations. It has a large variety of investments. The hearings disclose the nature of those investments.

Incidentally, I may say to the gentleman they include \$132,000,000 of time certificates issued by the Treasury Department which are drawing around 5 per cent. I assume they are investing in those because the interest on them will pay the interest on the 5 per cent notes that they have issued. More than that, they have loaned the railroads at one time something like \$200,000,000. Those loans have been paid down to something between sixty and seventy million dollars. Out of this appropriation some of those roads will pay the War Finance Corporation. The gentleman is driving at the Liberty bond

provision, I take it. The committee was up against the proposition of reporting out either this proposition or appropriating \$90,000,000 more out of the Treasury and leaving the War Finance Corporation with its \$600,000,000, \$132,000,000 practically of cash, or an equivalent that it could invest in any way it saw fit under the law.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the War Finance Corporation a creature of Congress in one of the war acts which contained provisions as to its being terminated? This provision in this bill will continue that corporation as long as the Railroad Administration may think it necessary to continue its activities.

Mr. GOOD. No; the terms of the law creating the War Finance Corporation provide that it shall terminate one year after the President shall have issued a proclamation of peace.

Mr. WALSH. If the peace resolution which passed the House passes the Senate and receives the Executive signature—if one may indulge in such a violent presumption—it would terminate the War Finance Corporation one year after it was signed?

Mr. GOOD. One year after the proclamation of peace.

Mr. WALSH. That would undoubtedly be before the Railroad Administration was ready to terminate its activities.

Mr. GOOD. This provision only authorizes the War Finance Corporation as it gets the funds to purchase these bonds. These certificates are Treasury certificates, amounting in the aggregate to over \$132,000,000, owned by the War Finance Corporation, are maturing every few days, and they will all mature long before a year has passed. Therefore it will be the duty of the War Finance Corporation, just as rapidly as it has the money from that source and other sources, to take up these Liberty and Victory bonds.

Mr. WALSH. Of course that eventually will revert to the Treasury and be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury, I assume. Why would it not be better and less complex to substitute for the War Finance Corporation the Secretary of the Treasury and let these bonds be taken over by the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time?

Mr. GOOD. That would require an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. It may require an appropriation, but if we made available the funds of the War Finance Corporation for that purpose it would not.

Mr. GOOD. The War Finance Corporation in this respect is practically the agent of the Secretary of the Treasury. That was the purpose of the law.

Mr. WALSH. It is a pretty free agent.

Mr. GOOD. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is a dangerous thing to leave any agency of the Government handling Government funds, practically unlimited in amount, with power to invest in bonds, stocks, loans, and other enterprises. I would not object if by some means the War Finance Corporation was compelled right away to use all of its capital and purchase Liberty bonds. This is a step in that direction as far as we can go, and I think the gentleman will find that it is along the line of conserving our resources.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman any information as to the amount which would be immediately available for the purchase of these bonds?

Mr. GOOD. I have not. The gentleman means so far as cash in the hands of the War Finance Corporation is concerned?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The War Finance Corporation, if I understand the situation correctly, within the last week received something like \$10,000,000 from the Illinois Central Railroad Co. It is receiving money in such large sums every day that a statement made to-day would not reveal what the condition was a few days ago.

Mr. WALSH. But this language would seek to encourage the War Finance Corporation to continue its activities and engage in enterprises or transactions which might be used as a basis for continuing this corporation long after it expires by the present legislation.

Mr. GOOD. The language was drawn in this way simply to get around any claim that might be made on the floor of the House or elsewhere that if we required them to purchase these bonds at once it might be urged that that would necessitate their throwing on the market some other securities. We did not want to do that, because we knew that within the next six months the War Finance Corporation would have much more money coming in by these certificates of indebtedness of the Treasury Department that are maturing, so that they could take them over in cash without selling a single security.

Mr. WALSH. But it says as rapidly as funds become available. They might go into all sorts of activities which would require the continuation of the War Finance Corporation for a number of years in order that funds might become available for this purpose.

Mr. GOOD. We have put in the provision here that as rapidly as funds become available, just as fast as the money comes into the War Finance Corporation, it shall be used to purchase these Liberty and Victory bonds, and hence such funds could not be used for other purposes. As I have explained to the gentleman, the \$132,000,000 of short-time Treasury certificates in the vaults of the War Finance Corporation will soon mature, and within a short time it will have more money than will be necessary in cash to take over these bonds. It is likely to make collection on loans made to the railroads.

Mr. WALSH. That is true; but we are enlarging the jurisdiction or broadening the scope of the authority of the War Finance Corporation by this very paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. WALSH. Then what is the necessity for it?

Mr. GOOD. Simply to compel it to use its funds to take over these bonds, to take this investment. They already have \$372,000,000 of Victory and Liberty bonds.

Mr. WALSH. The War Finance Corporation?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; purchased under the original act, and they have the right to go out and lend money to banks and purchase securities. There are a whole lot of propositions now pending before Congress which if passed would encroach upon the funds of the War Finance Corporation. It was the thought of the Committee on Appropriations that by requiring them to use their money for the purchase of Victory and Liberty bonds now owned by the Railroad Administration, which have been purchased by the taxpayers' money, it was simply to transfer to one arm of the Government that needed money from another arm of the Government that had appropriations for investment.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am impressed by the explanation of the gentleman from Iowa. I fear, however, that this paragraph is likely to be cited as the reason for continuing the War Finance Corporation beyond what was originally intended. If the gentleman thinks it is not going to interfere with the winding up of that corporation, which was provided for by the Congress as a war authority to be exercised directly in connection with the financing of the war and stabilizing matters, that the adoption of this provision will not prevent its being wound up, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. On the contrary, the gentleman from Iowa would not be in favor of it, would not have been in favor of reporting it, if he thought it would continue or extend the life of the War Finance Corporation. On the contrary, I believe it is going to shorten the life of the war-time finance corporation, and it will limit their activities, and I think, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has so well expressed it, this war agency ought to be terminated just as soon as possible to terminate it.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order for the purpose of asking a question, or rather I reserve the point of order. This War Finance Board is purely a war measure?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the distinguished chairman, should the so-called peace resolution upon which the House spent some two days' time a short time ago, if the Senate should ever take that up—by the way, could the chairman tell us whether or not the Senate has taken that up yet?

Mr. GOOD. No; I know nothing about it.

Mr. BLANTON. The purpose of our time here then has been met by passing it by the House. Is that the case?

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about it.

Mr. BLANTON. Should the Senate some time in the future, this year or next year, decide to take that up and should pass it and it should become a law, would that do away with this Finance Corporation?

Mr. GOOD. The law creating the War Finance Corporation provides in specific terms that it shall continue until one year after the President shall have proclaimed that a state of peace exists, no matter whether that proclamation is arrived at by reason of the treaty or the resolution referred to by the gentleman. So the War Finance Corporation will continue, unless the Congress shall take some action, for a period of one year after that time.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the passing over of the point of order now would not prevent this provision, if it should be renewed on the appropriation bill later on, from being subject to the point of order later on?

Mr. GOOD. I do not quite understand the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The mere fact that we passed it by here now would not prevent the point of order being good against such a provision in another bill of this kind?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; not at all, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman if any of the appropriation carried in this bill is to be used for the six months' guaranty under the transportation act; and if so, how much?

Mr. GOOD. No; there is an indefinite appropriation carried in the transportation act covering that very item. That act was approved February 28, and we have not carried anything in the bill for the railroads under private operation, not a dollar. The whole appropriation refers to Government control and operation during the 26 months that they were under Federal control.

Mr. McKEOWN. Now, is there any statement before the committee of the gentleman relative to what action the short-line companies were taking which were not under Federal control during the 26 months to recover against the Government? Was that matter before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. GOOD. There was some discussion of that matter by Mr. Sherley. We are carrying in the bill a provision authorizing the amounts they owe the Government to be deducted from this payment to them. The gentleman remembers that section 204 of the transportation act carried an indefinite appropriation, whereby the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay these losses of the short lines, or these roads called short lines, that suffered certain losses under Federal control or because of Federal operation. Now, those losses are to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the commerce act, and certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury, and on such certificate the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay them.

Mr. McKEOWN. The Congress has no further control of the appropriations in settlement of those claims for the short lines?

Mr. GOOD. Nothing except an item carried in this bill, which permits a set-off.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman that I have heard that some 200 of these companies now are coming up and filing suits against the United States for losses, although they were not under Federal control.

Mr. GOOD. Well, the transportation act makes some provision for the payment of those losses, and my recollection is that Mr. Sherley stated that those losses might aggregate as much as \$25,000,000. There is an indefinite appropriation to pay them.

Mr. McKEOWN. The thing that struck me as rather strange was that we would permit those companies to come in without any restriction except passing on their claims and receiving a settlement; in other words, have the administration settle with these railroads without supervision of Congress. All other claimants against the Government are required to present their claims through the Court of Claims and have their claims satisfactorily established, and the mere fact that these railroads may have suffered some loss puts them in no worse condition than thousands of private citizens throughout the United States who have also suffered by reason of the war.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations did not go into that matter at all. It is a matter that Congress has just acted upon. There was no evidence before us, and we as a committee were only attempting to deal with the fiscal problems growing out of Federal control and problems growing out of—

Mr. McKEOWN. Was there any reason given why 15 years' payments were granted for allocation of rolling stock and equipment of railroads—why that length of time was given and why it was necessary?

Mr. GOOD. The committee went into that matter, and made inquiry as to why some cash payment was not made. Mr. Sherley has been working on the question of allocated equipment for several months. He had at one time thought that some arrangement had been about perfected whereby an equipment trust would be provided for and all of these bonds made to some equipment corporation and the bonds sold to the public. That fell through. Then the question came up as to how the railroads were going to pay for this equipment, amounting to almost \$400,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. The opinion he finally arrived at was that it would be foolish to exact a cash payment and then turn around and loan the money to the railroad company that made the cash payment, taking, perhaps, some inferior security for an equipment lien, and that the better plan would be to sell the

equipment to the railroads and take the equipment trust, payable in 15 payments, and that seemed to be, as he felt, the most reasonable and about the best terms he could settle this whole equipment matter upon.

Mr. McKEOWN. Who will make these settlements now between the Government and these railroads as to what they are entitled to? Shall this Railroad Administration continue to have that power?

Mr. GOOD. They have that power.

Mr. McKEOWN. And these men who are in charge have formerly been in the employment of railroads?

Mr. GOOD. The whole power is still in the hands of the President. The President has full power to settle with all these railroads. Now, the President, under the practice, has delegated that power, first to Mr. McAdoo as Director General, and then to Mr. Hines and his associates.

Mr. McKEOWN. Has Congress any control over that settlement?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all.

Mr. McKEOWN. The power was left to the President in the transportation act?

Mr. GOOD. No. That was the power that was given the President when the roads were turned over to the President.

Mr. McKEOWN. To make the final settlement?

Mr. GOOD. To make the final settlement.

Mr. McKEOWN. I thought that provision to make final settlement was carried in the transportation act that was recently passed and that he did not have the power in the other act to make final settlement with the railroads.

Mr. GOOD. The President has that power, and this money is under his control and the administration agents, and settlements are to be made by them.

Mr. McKEOWN. And to be made out of the appropriation in this bill?

Mr. GOOD. This bill, and an appropriation of \$500,000,000 that was made when the railroads were taken over and \$750,000,000 made last year and \$200,000,000 more carried in the transportation act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, simply to direct the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to what seems to be the practical effect of this language, namely, that it requires them to take over the bonds as rapidly as funds become available, but there is nothing there which would require the War Finance Corporation to make these funds available. They can decline to dispose of securities or other bonds or paper which they may have, and in that way entirely nullify the intent of this provision. Now, how, if the War Finance Corporation should not wish to do this thing, or if they felt that perhaps it would not be better to hold on to some securities they have, is this going to be of real effect?

Mr. GOOD. How can they refuse to accept money from the Secretary of the Treasury when the certificates of indebtedness which the War Finance Corporation holds mature?

Mr. WALSH. These certificates of indebtedness will be issued in the future, too.

Mr. GOOD. They will not have any power to take new certificates.

Mr. WALSH. Why not?

Mr. GOOD. Until they have taken these bonds. We worked over that with some care and with the thought in mind. The gentleman will read:

The War Finance Corporation, as rapidly as funds become available, shall take over from the United States Railroad Administration, at par value and accrued interest, these bonds.

Now, when they get \$10,000,000 of funds they can take over \$10,000,000 of these bonds. They have no right to use this money that is coming in on these short-time certificates in the way of making new investments until every one of these bonds is taken over.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps so, but suppose we get the \$10,000,000 for the certificates, and the Railroad Administration says, "Why, yes; we have got \$6,000,000 of Victory bonds, but we wish to retain them for a little while; we do not care to dispense with them just yet, as we may be able to use them in settling up with certain claimants?"

Mr. GOOD. The Railroad Administration?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. They are anxious to let go of these bonds.

Mr. WALSH. That is the impression the committee has got. But suppose they are not anxious?

Mr. GOOD. They have some Liberty bonds there that are selling on the market for only 86 or 87 to-day. They are going to

get par for them. Do you think the Railroad Administration would want to part with them?

Mr. WALSH. Then what is the need of the language in the last line, "such issues as it does not desire to retain"?

Mr. GOOD. There will be some of those bonds that railroad employees are making payments on. Those employees should not be released from their obligation to take them where they are willing to take them, and it is only where the employee claims he can not pay for them, as I understand, that the administration has been taking those over. Now, then, that was put in there so as to permit the Railroad Administration to carry out its contract and deliver those bonds. Those bonds it is proposed to have the Director General to deliver to the employee who has purchased them. That is the reason for the language.

Mr. WALSH. So that the Railroad Administration, in the gentleman's opinion, will only seek to retain bonds which have been subscribed for by employees of the railroads and which they are purchasing but have not paid for fully?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and are making payments upon. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in certifying to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount payable to any carrier under paragraphs (f) and (g) of section 204 of the transportation act, 1920, also shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums, if any, as may be due from such carrier to the President (as operator of transportation systems under Federal control) on account of traffic balances or other indebtedness. The amount so certified to be due the President, upon his request, shall be deducted by the Secretary of the Treasury from the amount so certified to be due such carrier and thereupon shall be credited by him to the appropriation made in section 202 of the transportation act, 1920. Such deductions shall be considered as a payment pro tanto of such indebtedness to the Government.

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OGDEN: Page 3, after line 3, insert: "American Printing House for the Blind: To enable the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 4, 1919, \$10,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane and is new legislation and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not a deficiency, too, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is a deficiency, however. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, carries the balance of the authorization provided for in the act approved August 4, 1919. The deficiency bill which was approved November 4, 1919, appropriated or carried \$30,000 of that authorization. Now, the \$30,000 has been expended on the program to replace obsolete and worn-out machinery with new machinery and to increase the supply of books for the blind. The amount so carried in the deficiency bill was not sufficient to complete this program or carry out the purpose set out in the act of August 4, 1919; hence the amount carried in this amendment is a deficiency in the sense that it carries out the purposes of that act. It therefore appears to me that the point of order is not well taken. A deficiency exists, and there is existing law authorizing the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. OGDEN] offers an amendment to the bill "to enable the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 4, 1919, \$10,000." To this amendment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes the point of order that it is not germane to the bill, or to any paragraph of the bill, and also that it is unauthorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not a deficiency, either, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And that it is not a deficiency. The Chair has examined the bill, and there is no provision in the bill relating to the care of the blind, and therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is not germane to the bill or to any section or paragraph of the bill. For that reason the Chair sustains the point. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS.

Repairs to suburban roads: For current work of repairs to suburban roads and suburban streets, including maintenance of motor vehicles, \$35,000.

Mr. HARRELD and Mr. McKEOWN rose.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wish to make an inquiry. We have made an appropriation of something like \$225,000 recently to improve the streets running out to the improved roads of Maryland. Does that item include this same amount?

Mr. GOOD. That, as I understand, was for repaving certain roads. This item is to supply a deficiency in an appropriation of \$200,000 made last year for repair of the roads in the District of Columbia that are outside of what is known as the old city of Washington. There was a balance a couple of weeks ago of about \$7,000 or \$8,000. Some of the roads are in a deplorable condition. They asked for \$75,000 and made the suggestion that if some of these roads were not repaired and damage should result, this Government might be liable. In other words, the roads are in a very bad condition, and ought to be put in a better state of repair.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The appropriation which the gentleman refers to is for the next fiscal year?

Mr. GOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I agree with him that the roads are in bad shape, being evidently affected by the severe winter weather. They seem to have gone to pieces quite a good deal in the outlying districts.

Mr. GOOD. I think that is so.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I wish to get some information about the item "including maintenance of motor vehicles." What is that for?

Mr. GOOD. What item does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. HARRELD. In that paragraph, line 21.

Mr. GOOD. That includes the motor trucks. It does not include passenger-carrying vehicles. It includes motor trucks and the equipment of the District of Columbia used in repairing roads.

Mr. HARRELD. Repairing roads?

Mr. GOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I presume an appropriation was made before for this same work or similar work?

Mr. GOOD. There was an appropriation in last year's District of Columbia bill for \$200,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Did the bill name the streets on which the money was to be expended?

Mr. GOOD. No. That is a lump sum for repairs. It does not name the streets for repairs of this kind. If there is a permanent improvement it names the streets that are to be permanently improved.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I ask the question because sometimes the department uses up all the money that has been appropriated for it, all that Congress thought it should have, and then comes in and asks for an additional appropriation under the heading of a deficiency, when, in fact, those additional appropriations are really not a deficiency at all.

Mr. GOOD. They claim the appropriation this year was insufficient, first, because of the increased cost of labor, and then the increased number of these roads that had to be repaired, because they had not been repaired during the war. They were getting in very bad condition. Now, I know nothing about the question as to whether any preference was made in repairing some roads, and spending more money on some roads than on others, but the committee were impressed with the fact that it was absolutely necessary to make some appropriation. We cut the estimate from \$75,000 to \$35,000 for that purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I asked the question because it has occurred to me that some appropriations made under the guise of deficiencies are not deficiencies but additional appropriations. I think it can not be denied that in many instances we find the departments asking for a certain amount of money. They are allowed less money than they ask. When they take up the work they start out on a plan so large that they know the amount of money appropriated will not enable them to carry the work to the end, and when they have used up their appropriation they come and ask for additional money and call it a deficiency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it not true that if the heads of departments lived up to the law there could not be any such thing as a deficiency?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There is a law against creating a deficiency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; but they do not pay any attention to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is my complaint, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If they were compelled to live up to that law, a deficiency would be an utter impossibility. They will have to come to that some time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In many of these cases a deficiency does not actually occur, but the time when there will be a deficiency is approaching, and they come to the committee and ask for more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

For two additional members of the commission, at the rate of \$12,000 per annum each, from April 16 to June 30, 1920, inclusive; and for the amount required to increase the compensation of nine members of the commission from \$10,000 to \$12,000 per annum each and the secretary of the commission from \$5,000 to \$7,500 per annum from February 28 to June 30, 1920, inclusive, \$7,004.23.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. Good: Page 4, line 22, after the word "inclusive," strike out the figures "\$7,004.23" and insert the figures "\$12,004.23."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman how he and his committee made a mistake of \$5,000?

Mr. GOOD. It was simply an oversight. After the word "inclusive," in line 18, there should have been inserted "\$5,000." That is the amount that it takes to pay the compensation of these two additional members of the commission. When we came to check up the total we found that sum had been inadvertently omitted.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman and his committee have the benefit of the guidance of this million-dollar clerk to whom some time ago, not by my vote, the House gave \$1,000 for saving the country so much money?

Mr. GOOD. The committee has the services and the advice of very, very efficient clerks. They work day and night; last night they worked until nearly midnight. Under that kind of stress oversights of this sort are bound to creep in, no matter how efficient the clerks are.

Mr. BLANTON. They happen in the best regulated families.

Mr. GOOD. It was a mistake, frankly admitted, and we want to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Distribution of card indexes: For services of assistants at salaries less than \$1,000 per annum and for piecework and work by the hour, \$2,700.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Ireland: Page 5, after line 15, insert: "For payment to Mrs. Fannie Lackland Washington, widow of Lawrence Washington, late attendant in the Representatives' reading room of the Library of Congress, \$1,250."

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, as every Member of the House is quite well aware, if this amendment receives the favorable action of the House, the recipient of the amount is the widow of the late attendant in the Representatives' room in the Library of Congress.

Lawrence Washington was the last of the male line of that name born in Mount Vernon, and he was born in the room in which the Father of his Country died. He began his employment in the Library of Congress in 1897 at a salary of \$900 a year. Later that was increased to \$1,200 and then to \$1,500, and last year he finally reached the magnificent compensation of \$2,000 per annum for his services. I am told by all the Members who have employed the reference library under his direction and assistance that he was a wonderfully efficient man in the service and beloved by all who knew him.

Some days ago the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. Fess, sent to the Committee on Accounts a resolution to pay to the widow of the deceased the usual compensation granted by the House to its employees of six months' salary and \$250 for funeral expenses.

The late Lawrence Washington was not technically in the employ of the House, and the Committee on Accounts, by whose direction and authority I act in offering this amendment, sought not to create a precedent in this regard; and I think it was the sentiment of the entire committee who were present that it should be offered on some appropriation bill, and that no objection would be made to it, but that they did not care to have it brought in as a report from the Committee on Accounts and thereby set a precedent of that sort. I am sure that our sense of chivalry, justice, and equity will not allow us to take any other than a favorable action on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I would make the point of order against and oppose this amendment. But I can not find it in my heart to oppose this one. I am one of the Members who was intimately acquainted with Mr. Washington. I am one of the recipients of his many kind courtesies and helpful assistance. Mr. Washington had, on one occasion especially, stayed in that library over yonder until half past 3 a. m. assisting me in getting up some data. He has worked with me there several times until past midnight. An employee of the Government, working on a salary of \$2,000, who showed that much interest in Government work—I think this is a very small tribute to him. He was a man who loved his work. He was a man who took pride in it. He was a man who felt honored to be efficient in his work and was there ready to serve any Member day and night when called. I can not oppose this amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. While Mr. Washington was not technically an employee of this House, he was, in point of fact, an employee that served the membership of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; as a matter of fact and in spirit he was an employee in the service of the Members of this House. I do not believe there was a Member who ever asked assistance whose request he ever turned down. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this amendment presents a very bad precedent, but I hope it never will be used as a precedent. There are so many circumstances surrounding the whole situation, so many Members of the House have felt the justice of it, in view of the fact that Mr. Washington in his lifetime received a salary altogether inadequate for the service he performed, in view of the fact that he was the only male descendant bearing the name of Washington, the first President of the Republic—there has been so much sentiment in favor of it and so many Members have seen me in regard to it, suggesting that I would not make a point of order, that I can not oppose it; but I hope it will never be used, and should never be used, as a precedent in asking Congress to make an appropriation in this manner for the family of an employee of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

For medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for war-risk insurance patients and other beneficiaries of the Public Health Service, including necessary personnel, regular and reserve commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, clerical help in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, maintenance, equipment, leases, fuel, lights, water, printing, freight, transportation and travel, maintenance and operation of passenger motor vehicles, and reasonable burial expenses (not exceeding \$100 for any patient dying in hospital), \$7,666,187.14.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, after line 19, insert the following: "Miscellaneous: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act for the relief of the estate of John M. Lea, deceased,' approved April 7, 1920, \$6,883.31."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the act approved April 7, 1920, reads as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, in full settlement of the following claim, to the Nashville Trust Co., administrator de bonis non cum testamento annexo of the estate of John M. Lea, deceased, late of Nashville, Tenn., the sum of \$6,883.31, that being the amount found due by the Court of Claims for rents collected by the Quartermaster's Department, United States Army, during the Civil War from the tenants of said John M. Lea, which rents were paid into the Treasury of the United States, as reported to Congress in Senate Document No. 48, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

Under the law the Comptroller of the Treasury has held that inasmuch as that language does not provide for an "appropriation

out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," that it was not an appropriation. It was clearly the intention of Congress to appropriate the money. The act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay this sum. Now, this amendment is to correct the defect in that language in the act of April 7, 1920, and I am directed by the committee to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

Denver, Colo., Mint: For wages of workmen and other employees, \$16,500.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the section. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the term "and elsewhere" with respect to clerical help is not a new clause.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is the same as the original appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. The Health Department has an appropriation for clerical help elsewhere?

Mr. GOOD. A great deal of the clerical help is outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, after line 4, insert the following:

"Public buildings—Relief of contractors: For an additional amount for the payment of claims of contractors, etc., arising under the act entitled 'An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors of the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes,' approved August 25, 1919, as amended, \$500,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill nor to any paragraph in it, that it is new legislation unauthorized by law.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. It was eliminated formerly on a point of order from another bill.

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. BLANTON. I made the point of order to this same provision in another bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the situation with regard to this appropriation is this: There is an appropriation this year of \$500,000 to pay these contractors. An act was passed, approved August 25, 1919, providing that certain contractors who had contracts for Government buildings, if they sustained loss because of war conditions on contracts that were approved before we went into the war, but which had to be completed during the war, should be reimbursed for actual losses sustained because of war conditions. That is the law. We appropriated \$500,000 for that purpose. I am placed in a rather embarrassing position with regard to this item. The item would have been put in the bill but for the fact that the committee desired to save the cost of printing. When it was brought up in the committee I was requested to bring it up on the floor of the House. The only way that it is subject to a point of order, under the ruling of the Chair, is that it is not germane.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Another deficiency bill is to be brought in.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It may be incorporated in that bill.

Mr. GOOD. Let me explain the matter to the gentleman a little further. The estimates for the amount now pending before the sundry civil appropriation bill subcommittee are for \$1,750,000. The amount that we appropriate here will be deducted from that appropriation. The mere fact that it should go out here will embarrass to a considerable extent certain firms that are now on the threshold of bankruptcy.

Mr. BLANTON. I would have no objection to the amendment if it did not provide for payment for contracts that were not finished in accordance with the terms of the contract, but the amendment, as I caught it, authorized payment for losses where the contractors failed to carry out their contracts, in finishing construction.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; they can not be paid anything except on those contracts that are completed in accordance with the terms of the act of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. On reading the amendment, I see that is so, and I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if this appropriation of \$7,566,000 is intended to cover the expenses of some of the service men who have been placed by the Health Service in private hospitals and institutions.

Mr. GOOD. Yes. This appropriation is available for the operation of Public Health Service hospitals, including marine hospitals, and also for men who are in contract hospitals.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it possible out of this appropriation to construct hospitals for the men?

Mr. GOOD. It is not. This appropriation is merely a maintenance item.

Mr. BARBOUR. And it will take care of those who are placed in private institutions?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION.

Washington, D. C., Government hotel for Government workers: For maintenance, operation, and management of the hotel and restaurant therein, including personal services, \$275,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I want to ask the chairman if we are to expend \$275,000 each quarter for the maintenance of this Government hotel for civilian workers?

Mr. GOOD. For the months of April, May, and June; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the chairman believes that where these hotel buildings are furnished by the Government, where the furniture in them and all the paraphernalia and everything else—the cooking department and everything—are furnished by the Government, we have to appropriate here every three months \$275,000 to carry on the institution for the civilian workers of this Government? Is that his plan as an economist in this House?

Mr. GOOD. That is the plan of the Department of Labor in conducting the hotel.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think we ought to tear down those buildings and throw them into the Potomac River and save this money, rather than carry on an expense that costs us a million one hundred thousand dollars a year over and above the income from it?

Mr. GOOD. The Potomac is a very beautiful river, and I should hate to see its beauty interfered with by depositing those buildings in it. [Laughter.] I will say this to the gentleman from Texas: Congress, about eight months ago, provided by law that all the receipts from the operation of this hotel should be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Now, they pay all their receipts into the Treasury. According to the statement made before the committee in the operation of this hotel there will be during the year a profit of around \$25,000. It was necessary to make an appropriation at the beginning of the year to carry on that hotel. There are about 1,700 Government clerks, young ladies, who are housed and furnished two meals a day in those buildings. We appropriated \$700,000 for that purpose. They will run out of funds entirely the 1st of April, and this is to make an appropriation for their subsistence.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the chairman remember the statement put in the report on the bill by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] some time ago, showing the enormous salaries the employees of this housing department were receiving, allowed them by the Secretary of Labor, and the legislation doing away with the housing department? The gentleman remembers that report, does he not?

Mr. GOOD. It has not become a law yet.

Mr. BLANTON. But it passed this House last December. Has the gentleman made any investigation to find out just what kind of salaries these people are drawing now in connection with this hotel business?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; we have had a full list of the salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. What are those salaries?

Mr. GOOD. They run all the way up to \$5,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Do the cooks and waiters get \$5,000 a year?

Mr. GOOD. No; they do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, men performing service less valuable than cooks and waiters, in the report made by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], were drawing even up to \$10,000, allowed them by the Secretary of Labor. One of them, I think, drew as high as \$10,000. I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky if I am mistaken?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; but the gentleman is mistaken in the statement that there are any now who are getting that much salary.

Mr. BLANTON. But it was in the gentleman's report.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. I think one lacked about \$2.50 of getting \$10,000.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not at the moment recall the exact amounts, but they were too much, and I think some are now getting too much. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman's criticism, but I do not care to discuss the matter now because we are going to have a conference on that bill in the next two or three days.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman going to end this monkey business?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am going to try to help do it.

Mr. BLANTON. We should dispense with these high-salaried employees down there drawing that kind of a salary.

Mr. LANGLEY. I agree with the gentleman, and I am going to try to help secure the enactment of a law that will prevent the payment of salaries in excess of what the service rendered deserves.

Mr. GOOD. The committee has given less money than was asked for the rest of the year. There is a bill pending, as the gentleman knows, in conference for the purpose of turning this whole organization over to the Treasury Department.

Mr. BLANTON. And it has not been pigeonholed at the other end of the Capitol?

Mr. GOOD. I am not familiar with the history of that bill.

Mr. BLANTON. We passed it so long ago that most of us had forgotten all about it, but I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LANGLEY. There has been some delay, due to conditions that I shall be glad to explain when I bring the conference report up in the House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do that only to say this in reply to what the gentleman from Texas has said, that I know very little as to the report to which the gentleman refers having been made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]; but the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations would indicate that the Government hotels under the present management are being economically conducted. There is no evidence of any excessive salary being paid at this time, and so far as the Government continuing in the hotel business, Miss James, who is now in control of it, stated she is personally opposed to the Government continuing in the business. The statement presented to the committee by Miss James justifies entirely the action of the House in appropriating this amount.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is it the purpose of the Government to abandon those buildings down there entirely, or just abandon the hotel part of it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I am not in position to answer the gentleman. That depends in great measure on the legislation which is pending and which has been referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Botanic Garden.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. Good: Page 6, strike out line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"LEGISLATIVE.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"To pay the widow of William J. Browning, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, \$7,500.

"BOTANIC GARDEN."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13677, the deficiency appropriation bill, and had directed him to report

the same to the House with certain amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. On that I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 86, noes 0.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. Good, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALMON, for to-day, on account of illness.

To Mr. WELTY, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LUHRING, for 10 days, on account of business.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS SIGNATURE.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 12260. An act to amend section 600 of the act approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 12581. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village and township of Shelly, Norman County, Minn., and the township of Caledonia, Traill County, N. Dak., and their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between the said States.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 4163. An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11578. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4073. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 21, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13627) to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 856), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12437) to authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000, heretofore appropriated for the erection of a United States post office, courthouse, and jail at Cordova, Alaska, by the act approved March 4, 1913, for the erection of a United States courthouse and jail at Cordova, Alaska, reported the same without amendment, accompa-

nied by a report (No. 857), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13650) to amend "An act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia," approved January 25, 1910, as amended, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 858), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13696) to amend subsection 11 of section 231 of the war-revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13697) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 13698) to amend an act authorizing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls in their respective departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIGSBY: A bill (H. R. 13699) to vacate a portion of the naval barracks tract reserve situated at Sitka, Alaska, and to vest the title thereto in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13700) increasing the pay of bookbinders and bookbinder machine operators employed in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13701) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to the Peoples Investment Co. (Inc.) certain lands in Louisiana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARRISH (by request): A bill (H. R. 13702) amending the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 13703) to authorize association of producers of agricultural products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13704) to establish in the Treasury Department a bureau of supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 13705) providing equal pay for equal service on street railways within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 13706) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors, including material men, for work under the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13707) to prevent desecration of the flag and insignia of the United States and to provide punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13722) to further regulate certain public-service corporations operating within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUSTED: Resolution (H. Res. 526) providing for certain employees and the payment of the expenses of the Judiciary Committee or a subcommittee thereof incurred pursuant to the provisions of House resolution 469, adopted March 4, 1920; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Resolution (H. Res. 527) for the immediate consideration of House bill 12466; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RICKETTS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Chillicothe, Ohio, tents and cots for use of Boy Scout organization of that city in their annual encampment during the month of July and August, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 13708) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ingle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 13709) granting an increase of pension to Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRELD: A bill (H. R. 13710) granting an increase of pension to Catherine F. Edsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 13711) granting an increase of pension to John Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 13712) granting a pension to Margaret Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 13713) granting a pension to Anna Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13714) to refund certain duties paid by the Nash Motors Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13715) granting a pension to John Gust Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 13716) granting an increase of pension to Louisa White Spurgeon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 13717) to reimburse the Midwood Park Property Owners' Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13718) granting a pension to Ubert C. Ricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13719) for the appointment of William Edward Tidwell as first lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 13720) granting a pension to Pierre Reidt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13721) granting a pension to Edward Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3087. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Raymond D. Austin Post, No. 115, American Legion, of Delaware, Ohio, urging favorable legislation on bonus for soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3088. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of International Association of Machinists, Boston Lodge, No. 264, urging the necessity of granting immediate amnesty to all prisoners whose religious, political, or economic beliefs form the basis of their prosecution, trial, and imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3089. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of L. M. Passarello and 18 other residents of Philadelphia, Pa., in behalf of the Sterling-Lehbach civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3090. Also, petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, in behalf of appropriations for the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3091. Also, petition of Prince-Forbes Post, No. 7, the American Legion, of Philadelphia, Pa., in support of the fourfold plan of bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3092. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the National Association of Box Manufacturers, Chicago, Ill., urging that the present excess-profits tax be abandoned, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3093. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Lock Co. and the Fyrac Manufacturing Co., of Rockford, Ill., opposing House bill 12976; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3094. Also, petition of J. D. Hollingshead & Co., Chicago, Ill., opposing House bills 12379 and 12646; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3095. Also, petition of the Boone Post, No. 77, American Legion, Belvidere, Ill., and the Illinois Department, No. 309, Mid-Nation Post, Chicago, Ill., relative to the bonus for the ex-service men of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3096. Also, petition of the Wooden Box Manufacturers' Association, favoring a revision of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3097. Also, petition of the City Council of La Salle, Ill., favoring the Mason bill for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3098. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Wooden Box Manufacturers' Association, of New York City, favoring a revision of the antitrust act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3099. Also, petition of the Cap and Millinery Cutters' Union, Local No. 2, New York, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 171 and Senate bill 1233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3100. By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Dr. E. Florence Gaer and 45 residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3101. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Chelsea Post, No. 34, American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, urging the fourfold plan as a bonus for the ex-service men of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3102. Also, petition of Paton MacGilvary, Boston, Mass., relative to House bill 10918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3103. Also, petition of the Federal Employees' Local Union, Boston, Mass., against the Smoot amendment to the legislative appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3104. Also, petition of Federal Employees' Local Union, of Boston, urging the passage of the civil service retirement bill, etc.; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3105. Also, petition of American War Veterans' Association of City and County Employees, of Boston, Mass., against the passage of any bill that would exclude from its benefits any soldier, sailor, or marine who served in the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3106. Also, petition of American Felt Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 12379; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3107. Also, petition of National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Boston, Mass., urging the passage of the Fuller bill, House bill 13261; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

3108. Also, petition of Gray Silver, Charles A. Lyman, and T. C. Atkeson, Washington, D. C., urging the passage of the Capper-Hersman bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3109. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Federation of Post Office Clerks, Springfield, Mass., urging reform in the Postal Service, compensation, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3110. Also, petition of American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, urging the passage of House bill 13407; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3111. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the Colorado Springs Post, No. 5, American Legion, urging the fourfold plan of compensation for the ex-service men of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3112. By Mr. WEBSTER: Petition of H. C. Pearson and a number of other citizens of Spokane, Wash., indorsing House bill 1112, providing for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 21, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that we feel the weight of responsibility for that eternal vigilance which is the price of our liberties. We thank Thee that in addressing ourselves to the high office of this place we are doing so with a sense of our tremendous responsibility, and we seek the guidance of the changeless and unerring God that Thy law may be the law of our land and Thy will wrought out in all the work and labor of our hands. Bless us as a Nation and people and make us a blessing to the world. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13677) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4073. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City; and